RESTORATION

Review

In This Issue:

HAVE YOU MET SOCRATES?

by

Harry and Bonaro Overstreet

The unexamined life is not worth living.
—Socrates

Vol. 1, No. 2

Spring, 1959

Volume 1, No. 2 **Leroy Garrett, Editor** **Spring 1959**

RESTORATION *Review*

A Quarterly Journal of Philosophy of Restoration

Dedicated to the Task of Defining the
Restoration of Primitive Christianity as the
Spiritual, Moral and Intellectual Ideal of

Modern Man

LEROY GARRETT, *Editor*
CLINT EVANS, *Publisher*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Editorial	65
Have You Met Socrates?, *Harry and Bonaro Overstreet*	68
The Cup of Fury, *Upton Sinclair*	73
Ministry and Restoration, *W. Carl Ketcherside*	81
My Dream of the Restored Church, *Leroy Garrett*	91
Notes on Recent Literature	110
The Great Conversation	119

Published in January, April, July, and October by Restoration Press, 1916 Western Dr., Alton, Illinois.

Subscription rate is $2.00 per annum; three years for $5.00; in clubs of 10 or more, $1.00 per annum; single copies 50¢ each.

Entered as second class matter at post office at Alton, Illinois.

*Mailing Address: RESTORATION *Review*
1916 Western Drive
Alton, Illinois

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

OVER HALF THE WORLD IS STARVING

It is not often that a hungry man stands at our door begging for food. If all the hungry people of the world stood in single file at our door, the line would circle the earth and return to our door again—not just once or twice, but twenty-five times! If you drove ten hours a day, averaging fifty miles an hour, it would take you three and a half years to cover the length of the present line of hungry humanity. And as population increases this line expands over twenty miles a day! If we arranged these starving people into large cities, they would make fifty-seven cities each with a population as large as London, New York, and Tokyo put together.

Another way to say it is that sixty percent of the 2.7 billion people of the world do not have enough to eat. Many of these actually die of starvation, while millions more barely subsist. Man's daily intake should be between 2,500 and 5,000 calories. The diet level of the worst concentration camps is about 1,200 calories a day. As recently as 1957 the 80 millions of people of Indonesia subsisted on this near-starvation diet. One and a half billion people in the world eat *less* than half the necessary caloric intake. This means that over half the world is receiving the equivalent of a bowl of rice and a few slices of bread per day!

A correspondent of *Time* recounted his experience with China's starving millions by saying, "My notes tell me that I am reporting only what I saw or verified; yet even to me it seems unreal." He tells of how babies were abandoned to cry and die on every highway and how peasants would seek dead human flesh under the cover of darkness. He saw dogs eating human bodies by the roads. Trees are peeled of their bark and leaves, straw, cottonseed, and water reed are forced into empty stomachs. Five millions of Honan's 34 millions will have died by the time the next harvest is gathered. When they die, the reporter says, they just lie down in the slush or gutters and give up.

In addition to all the physical and mental anguish of starvation there is the moral dimension to be considered. It is very difficult for a hungry man to live right. History tells us that even the sainted passengers of the Mayflower "fell to plain stealing both night and day from ye Indians" when hunger overtook them. Irrespective of his background or culture the hungry man is indelicate and probably dangerous. Josephus tells us that even women became so indelicate as to devour their own babies during the terrible siege of Jerusalem by the Romans. Undernourishment motivates man's most basic urge—*survival*! It is this urge that leads men to eat rats and children to grovel in the dirt to find something to fill their empty stomachs.

The uncomely behavior pattern of the hungry man has lead Herbert Hoover to say that hunger is more destructive than armies, not only in human life, but in morale. He states that all the values of right living and all the gains of civilization crumble in a society that is starving. Those of us who live in a land of plenty must realize that such ideas as democracy, liberty, and Christianity have little appeal to the man with hunger pangs shooting through him. Bread means more to him than sermons; rice means more than talk about the four freedoms.

As I write these words a book is open before me with pictures of suffering humanity. One pictorial shows a crude school room with some twenty children sitting on the floor before a poorly-trained teacher. The caption reads, "Every second one human being dies because he has lacked common knowledge." Another picture is of a man holding his starving child, while still another is an anxious mother with a sick child. Other pictures reveal the drab huts made of cardboard where desperate people try to keep alive. Oh, how my heart bleeds for these people! They are *my* people, children of the same heavenly Father. I must love them and be concerned for them. As I sit in a comfortable home before a table of plenty I must not forget that I have brothers and sisters who would be happy to have my leftovers. Is it right for me to have so much while they have so little. Surely one of the world's greatest needs is approximate economic equality.

What can I do? Where can I start? The problem is so great that even if the entire North American continent were to double its food production and distribute all its surplus to the needy countries it would only make a dent in an almost impossible situation. Yet there is *something* I can do. I can start by being concerned, which would be a new venture for the average American. I can also pray fervently about the situation. What I can do beyond this is questionable, but I can at least be "grieved over the ruin of Joseph" rather than immerse myself in the vanity and luxury of a sensate culture. It is questionable as to whether a nation that spends billions on the habit of war and the habit of liquor has a moral conscience.

I should not close this editorial without stating that something is being done for the destitute of the world and that there is a small part that each of us can play. The United Nations is of course committed to the task of creating conditions leading to work and food for all and health enough for zest in living. Its aim is to assist people everywhere to accept their role as members of the Family of Man. The U.N. is mustering great organizational and financial strength in programs on the levels of food, agriculture, education, science, and culture. UNESCO is now beyond the crawling stage in its efforts to help the farmer who works with a wooden plow. It is especially interested in the 60 per cent of the world's population that has a yearly income of around $60 and a life expectancy of 30 years. It is realized that the way to solve the problem is through the resources of the people themselves.

By means of its Point Four program, Marshall Plan, IIAA, and military assistance the United States has poured billions into aid for backward nations. Point Four is especially significant since its function is to educate rather than merely to disperse dollars. It not only shows the destitute that they should use a hoe instead of a bent stick, but it also works on friendship and confidence. The Colombo Plan, consisting of eighteen nations, is likewise in the fight for better living conditions. Then there are many voluntary organizations that add a few more drops of mercy. The Rockefeller Foundation, for instance, has been active in more than eighty different countries for nearly 45 years. It labors for increased food production, medical and public health training, a virus research program, support for population studies, and it supports 250 scientists to work in destitute areas each year. The Ford Foundation recently invested nearly 28 millions for economic and social development in Asia.

So there is some mercy still in the world, isn't there? CARE, for instance, sends jars to Greece so that 500,000 tons of food wasted annually for lack of canning equipment can be preserved. The Quakers conduct farm pilot courses in Israel and Jordan. There are many mission institutions, one being conducted by the Presbyterians which has for forty years worked for better methods of teaching elementary school in India.

There is *something* each of us can do. We can first of all join the society of those who care. Concern is an imperative!

"In my opinion to increase creative, unselfish love is at this present moment of human history the paramount task of humanity." (P. A. Sorokin)

Let's join the human race!-Stringfellow-Barr

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

HAVE YOU MET SOCRATES?

Harry and Bonaro Overstreet

What is philosophy? Philosophy is a special way of going at things. It is not the engineer's way nor the biologist's way; it is not the artist's way nor the businessman's way. Yet it is a way that has involved the energizing of some of the greatest minds of history.

Philosophy as a way of going at things involves man as a question-asking creature. Early in life, as soon as he gets words at his command, the child begins to ask questions. These spontaneous questions are oddly enough philosophical, for they include such issues as the origin and nature of man—"Where did I come from?," "What is this?," "Who am I?" A friend of ours who is the mother of a little boy called us one day and said, "You know, I suddenly had something happen that made me very tired." We knew by the undercurrent of her voice that she was laughing at herself. "My little boy came in and asked me, "Mother, who made God?" Then she added, "I can see ahead the many years he will be asking me about all those things that I don't know the answers to."

Life begins spontaneously and naturally, reaching toward life with question, question, question. When do children stop asking questions and begin handing back answers? And why is this? We do know that children run into a long desert period in which they ask few questions. This may be because we have framed education so that it would give back the answers. However this might be, we have a terrific responsibility for trying to understand what happens environmentally to the question-asker. As the child grows older he stops asking questions, but this is not because the questions have all been answered. He stops asking questions either because he has accepted answers that are still questions (though he does not realize this) or because he has given up feeling that life is something you go around trying to understand. He begins just to take life and that is it. So this is the one thing that must concern us all: *What happens to the philosophical, inquiring mind of the new human being?*

There is sense in which cultures, including our own Western world, recurrently become like the Prodigal Son. They have such experiences as to cause them to rise up and say, "I will return to the house of my father." As we think of encouraging our youth to philosophize, it may be that we are once more rising up with a determination to return to the house of our Father.

ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS

It is easy for us to be guilty of oversimplification as we try to bring order out of the multifariousness of life. We must go below the surfaces of life and take charge of situations rather than be pushed around by them. The way of analysis has taken us so far afield that it must now rectify itself. Since the nineteenth century the way of analysis has been taking things apart. It is like the child who takes the watch apart but cannot get it back together again. While the age of analysis was great, we must now enter upon the age of synthesis. Our people are restless in their desire to go after the meanings of life instead of the purely analytical. While knowledge increased tremendously during the age of analysis, it is nonetheless true that we must now return to the great synthetic tradition of putting the pieces together to see where we are and what it is all about. We must learn to cope with being human!

Philosophy has failed in our day largely because it has joined the analytical to the neglect of the synthetical. Plato stated that philosophy is a spectator of all time and existence, which was a great statement when we were young. If we were to make that statement in a professional philosophical gathering today, we would be looked upon as very outdated. But this synthetic approach must be part of the approach to life. What is the synthetic approach? It is more than a study of the history of philosophy, which is not synthetic, but rather a deadening analytic approach. The synthetic approach is a study of the totality of human personality. Philosophy should be studied in terms of the great personalities.

We can remember the thrill that came when we first encountered Ralph Waldo Emerson. It was long ago when we first met him, and he has never gone out of our lives. Here is a *man*, a human being who is well-rounded, who says many things that add so much to our lives. This is the synthetic approach, for the distinctive synthetic entity is the human personality.

SOCRATES THE MAN

When Socrates came into my life it was even a greater experience than meeting Emerson. The most precious approaches of life are coming in contact with the indubitably great personalities. It may be that academic philosophy has largely lost out because it has turned up its nose at that. What would be the effect on students if they came to know Socrates intimately and enthusiastically. It is certainly true that in religion one has a deep religious experience not merely by reading the Bible or going to church, but through an encounter with the great person, Jesus. It is through such an encounter that we get a glimpse of the truly great life.

One does not get the greatness out of philosophy by arguing about the abstract issues. Such greatness comes by "joining the human race" and meeting beautiful personalities.

In one of Edmund Arlington Robinson's poems he tells of a small boy for whom life had no meaning. The desperate youngster came to the point where suicide seemed to be the only answer. He resolved to jump in the river. As he hesitated on the bank something happened. Robinson puts it this way: "There came along a man who looked at him with such unexpected friendliness, and talked with him in such a common way, that life grew wonderfully different." The prime occupation of the teenager, and for all human beings, is taking the impact of life and learning how to handle it. We are to learn what may be done with the experience of being human.

Life looks wonderfully different to one who has companioned with Socrates. We can build better images of ourselves, creative images, by encountering those people to whom life looks wonderfully different. One of the first things that we discovered about each other after we met is that we both kept Socrates at our elbow. Socrates was for both of us a person who set an image of what life was like, that it is to be grandly and decently lived. This is true of all philosophy, right down through Socrates, Spinoza, William James, Emerson, Whitehead, and whom you will. Philosophy is the record of personality taking hold of life and wrestling with it, and seeing how you come out with meaning.

QUALITIES OF SOCRATES

Just think of this man we are going to meet. The people of his day had not known anything about him before, but somehow they learn about this man Socrates with his tremendously important qualities.

He was a "gadfly." He bothered people with his questions. They did not like to have him around. He could see through their superficialities. He was not deceived by stereotypes, cliches, and slogans. He could discern the contradictions in their shallow argumentation. Socrates made a nuisance of himself. He was a crank! And yet look at this man: *He was the wisest man in Greece.* Why? Because he knew it all? No, but because he knew that he did not know. Though he was the wisest he was the most modest. He made no claims of being an expert at anything. In fact he spent most of his time asking questions-trying to find out things!

By "gadflying" Socrates was putting complexity back into life. He stirred up minds that had become caught in dogma. He bothered those people who thought they had all the answers. He revealed to them that life is always more complex than it looks to one who has his patterns and opinions fixed. Dogmatism tends to drain the complexity out of life. Socrates had the rare ability of putting complexity back into life. Yet he was not the kind of trouble-maker who enjoys putting people on the spot. There is the obnoxious kind of gadfly who is only interested in showing off what he knows. Socrates was not like that.

Let us go across the centuries and look at William James again. We can imagine James and Socrates talking as they meet at a street corner. They are having a good time together now where there is room for both of them. James says that one of the functions of philosophy is to *make dogmas fluid again.* Fluid again? That is what Socrates was doing.

James said that one should have air and space in his soul, lest those around suffocate from the loss of good, sound thinking. He and Socrates were the kind of men who re-complexified life in a world guilty of over-simplification by dogma, habit, partisanship, preoccupation, institutionalization, and caution. A great person lets life be complex because he is not afraid of complexity.

And keep in mind the word *re-complexifying.* That is a beautiful word. In the classroom students should learn how varied the approaches to problems can be. Views that are too simple should be complexified. And yet this is to be done modestly. We should not trust the person who merely complexifies, making complexity an end in itself. Like Socrates we must learn to be humble in the face of complexity. The true philosopher realizes his own intellectual and spiritual need. He has the peculiar power to have coped with reality on so broad a front that he has encountered questions that he cannot answer, and he knows he cannot.

Socrates walked humbly with his God. He is the kind of person who could say, “The unexamined life is not worth living.” He was not making parlor talk when he said that, but rather he was in the presence of the judges who had the power of life and death in their hands. Socrates could have avoided a death penalty if he had agreed to stop asking questions, stop probing, stop upsetting things, stop making important people look silly.

The gadfly of Athens was not willing to live with a chloroformed mind, for that would not be life at all, and so he chose to die. When the executioner asked him if he were ready to die, he replied, “Do you not know that I have been preparing to die all my life.” He was not afraid. He even bathed himself and prepared his body for burial before drinking the hemlock. He spent his last hours talking about such great ideas as immortality.

This man who talked about the unexamined life not being worth the living is somebody to meet.

Harry and Bonaro Overstreet are a husband and wife team who lecture and write in the fields of philosophy and psychology. They have written such well known titles as *The Mature Mind, The Mind Goes Forth,* and *What We Must Know About Communism.* Harry is now retired from the post he held for 30 years as professor of philosophy at City College of New York. Bonaro is also a poetess. This lecture on Socrates was given at MacMurray College in a philosophy symposium directed by Prof. Garrett. It is here published for the first time. The editor has made a few alterations in transcribing it, all this with the gracious permission of the Overstreets.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

Some Startling Facts About . . .

THE CUP OF FURY

By Upton Sinclair

The liquor industry spends approximately $250,000,000 a year to advertise and promote its products, and additional millions of dollars on "educational" work. The liquor lobby is in every state capitol and in our national capitol; it has card files of executives and legislators. The lobby knows who its friends are, and it seeks to hold them. It knows who its enemies are, and it seeks to convert or defeat them.

The lobbies have several purposes. Always, of course, to fight against Prohibition movements and to campaign for lower taxes on liquors. They insist that they are four-square against drunkenness. Moderation is what they preach. Alcoholism is a "disease" they deplore.

Alcoholism is a disease, of course. But it scarcely seems to me that this excuses or clears the distillers of responsibility. Cancer does not advertise itself as a symbol of "thoughtful hospitality"; heart disease does not spend a quarter of a billion dollars annually to announce that it is an "aid to gracious living." Neither polio nor tuberculosis describe themselves in handsome posters and colorful magazine-spreads as a means to healthful relaxation and enjoyment. *The Brewers Digest* once discussed the sales condition of the beer industry, and reached the conclusion that it "had not yet found a satisfactory answer to the problem of introducing beer to a high percentage of the younger generation." *Other* diseases are not sold, advertised, pressured, promoted, lobbied and press-agented in this way. Other diseases are fought with drastic surgery or skilled preventive medicine.

I have come to a point in this book, I believe, where I must for a time depart from my stories about my friends and fellows in the world of writing. With you I want to look at facts and statistics about liquor; the chemistry of its effects, the extent of its damage and the cost of its depredations. With you I want to look at the record of youthful drinking in our nation today. These were the facts which impelled me to write this book; they frighten me, and they rouse in me a desire to fight with the weapon I know best—truthful words.

There are more than four and a half million alcoholics in this nation today, and almost three-quarters of a million of them are women. This is the figure given us by the Yale University Center of Alcoholic Studies. It is a figure for the year 1953, arrived at in the last month of 1955; but there is no reason to believe that the number of alcoholics decreased during the long months while statistics were gathered.

Indeed, every indication presented in the study is that the number today must be far higher. The percentage of alcoholics per 100,000 Americans increased only slightly between 1952 and 1953; but between 1940 and 1952, it increased by *forty-five percent* among males and *fifty-two percent* among females.

Notice that these figures are based on population—so that when one reads that there are 7,800 alcoholics in Washington, DC, for every 100,000 people, it means that there are 7,800 alcoholics in a group of people which includes newborn babies, grade-school children, young teenagers, adults who abstain completely, and finally the adults who drink. The figure of concern to me is how many of these adults who are "social drinkers" and "moderate drinkers" become alcoholics—because that's the way my father and his brothers began, and that's what Jack London and George Sterling thought they were, and what Hart Crane and Dylan Thomas hoped to be: "social drinkers."

The answer to my question comes from Dr. Andrew Ivy, professor of the Department of Physiology of the University of Illinois. Reporting the results of investigations made by the Institute of Scientific Studies for the Prevention of Alcoholism, Dr. Ivy declared that one out of every sixteen casual, social, moderate drinkers becomes an alcoholic; one out of nine becomes what he calls a "problem drinker." He went on to express the fear that should the present rate of increase in alcohol consumption and alcoholism continue, the ratio of the "problem drinker" to the "social drinker" will similarly increase within ten or fifteen years from one in nine to *one in five.*

Alcoholism is now the nation's fourth most serious health problem. Science has begun to find ways to treat it with a variety of weapons, vitamins and hormones to restore the body balance, drugs to decrease the pressure of psychological difficulties, other drugs to keep the alcoholic from going back to the bottle by making him violently ill if he "falls off the wagon," and psychotherapy to get at the emotional reasons for his urge to destroy himself with whiskey. Each day there are new studies of why liquor "gets at" some people more than others: it is a chemical imbalance, one school says. It is an allergy, says the next faction.

It is even made plain that in truth no one who drinks escapes ill effects. The December, 1953, issue of *Scientific American* magazine featured an article by Leon A. Greenberg, associate professor and director of the Department of Applied Physiology at Yale University. He is one of the founders of the Yale Center of Alcohol Studies, and the inventor of the Alcometer, the device by which the police tell whether you are High, Tight, or Drunk. There could be no better authority.

Dr. Greenberg tells us that alcohol is not digested, but passes directly into the bloodstream. When it reaches the brain, this is what happens:

> A blood concentration of about .05 per cent of alcohol, which in a person of average size results from drinking two or more ounces of whiskey, depresses the uppermost level of the brain—the center of inhibitions, restraint and judgment. At this stage the drinker feels that he is sitting on top of the world; he is "a free human being"; many of his normal inhibitions vanish; he takes personal and social liberties as the impulse prompts; he is long-winded and can lick anybody in the country. Such a man has undergone an obvious blunting of self-criticism.

Double that amount, and the drinker begins to stagger. Professor Greenberg tells us:

> Contrary to old and popular belief, alcohol does not stimulate the nervous system. The illusion of stimulation results from the removal of inhibitions and restraints. The effects may be compared to a releasing of the brakes, not a stepping on the accelerator. Even with a few drinks, digital dexterity is reduced; auditory and visual discrimination fall away; tactile perception is lowered; the speed of motor response drops. Despite these measurable losses, the drinker often asserts that his reaction, perception and discrimination are better.

This is the false effect, then, which has led so many writers to believe that their work is more fluent and inspired after a round of drinks. Like "peace gestures" from a warring nation, whiskey's first false glow succeeds in making even shrewd and trained observers let down their guard. They recognize the eventual danger, yet want to believe the present propaganda. Here, for example, is the way Stanley Walker expressed his thoughts on drinking in his book, *City Editor:*

> In the popular mind, a newspaper man is one who drinks a great deal. It is true that most newspaper men drink; it is also true that booze takes many of them to a pathetic ending. But the majority of newspaper men today are careful about their liquor; they have to be . . . the stories of reporters who write just as well on twelve highballs as when cold sober are utter bunk. A man may stagger horribly through writing a column while groggy and get by with it, but he would have done much better if he had had nothing to drink.

All the industry is now awakening to the fact that people indeed do "much better" when sober. Professor Greenberg and his colleagues at Yale report that the alcoholic worker is absent from his job an average of twenty-five days a year; that while *on* the job, his accident rate is double that of the normal employee. Current estimates are that alcoholic workers and employees with "hangovers" cost industry one billion dollars a year in money and 400,000,000 man-hours of time. Every day of the week, some 175,000 men and women are absent from work because of what they drank the night before.

And do you want the picture of other costs of drunkenness? Here in my state, it was announced that the cost of liquor-caused traffic casualties was over $36,500,000 in Los Angeles alone. In Massachusetts, they studied the relationship between the amount of money received as revenue income from the sale of liquor, and money paid out because of alcoholism; and they found that for everyone dollar of liquor revenue coming to the state

treasury, the taxpayer paid out $4.82 to take care of known liquor-caused cases, jail costs, hospitalization, emergency care on highways, and welfare work.

One final set of figures: in 1953, when—according to Yale University—there were 4,589,000 alcoholics in this nation, our national consumption of liquor was reckoned at 18.95 gallons *per person* reaching the staggering total of 3,002,000,000 gallons.

I reflect on all these figures, and in truth I would expect to find a nation united against the glamorizing of drinking. Instead I read in one of our smart magazines an account of two days spent with one of our most eminent novelists. I learned in the reading of it that the gentleman desires either bourbon or champagne every hour or two, and certainly devotes a good part of his conversation to the flavors and qualities of these liquors. In another publication, one of our most widely-circulated weekly magazines, there was an account of a second respected and eminent novelist. I quote a part of one sentence, with the permission of the magazine writer: "He escapes periodically and sometimes for periods of weeks into alcoholism, until his drinking has become legendary in his town and in his profession, and hospitalization and injections have on occasion been necessary to save his life."

I read these reports, and I wonder what the reaction of our youth will be as they peruse them. Will they feel, as did the Lamb hero, that one must burn the house to its foundation in order to roast a pig? Will they feel that the pathway to genius is through gin?

Just what is the pathway our youth is following?

Look with me, if you will, into a book which gives many of the answers. It is titled *Drinking in College,* and was written by Robert Straus and Selden D. Bacon, who based their report on research conducted at Yale University.

The subtitle of the work is "A Survey of the Customs and Attitudes Toward Alcohol of Men and Women in Twenty-seven American Colleges." The flaps of the book's jacket express its contents clearly:

> This is the long-awaited report of the survey conducted by the Yale Center of Alcoholic Studies on the drinking customs and attitudes of college students in the United States. From 1949 through 1951, seventeen thousand men and women students in twenty-seven colleges provided information about their social background and personal habits and attitudes toward liquor . . . Here at last is an organized body of factual knowledge to replace speculation, to provide a basis for a realistic explanation of behavior, and to suggest more reasonable and realistic action by persons. . . who are called upon to make important decisions and provide guidance for young people.
>
> College students are a group of particular significance for the study of drinking. They are at the age when drinking starts for many persons, initial experiences are fresh in their minds, and they easily identify the pressures and purposes associated with early drinking. This study shows who drinks and who does not, when and where those who drink first

started drinking, why and how much they drink, the influence of parents and the significance of income, religious affiliation, and ethnic background.

The basic mass figure is: seventy-four percent of all the 17,000 students "reported having used alcoholic beverages to some extent." The chapters of the book report on various aspects of the problem, and I quote a few of the figures:

Chapter Four: Seventy-nine percent of the men who drink and sixty-five percent of the women who drink report that their drinking started before entering college.

Chapter Six: *"Drinking Parents."* Two-thirds of the fathers drink, and so do forty-eight percent of the mothers.

Chapter Seven: *What do Students Drink?"* As first preference, the answer is: for men, forty-seven percent beer, eleven percent wine, forty-two percent spirits. For women the choices are: seventeen percent beer, twenty-five percent wine, and fifty-eight percent spirits.

Chapter Eight: *"How Much and How Often?"* Frequency during the past year, one to five times: for men, nineteen percent; for women, twenty-seven percent.

Twice a month to once a week: for men, thirty-six percent; for women, thirty-seven percent. Four or more days a week: for men, three percent; for women, one percent.

Chapter Nine: *"When, Where, with Whom?"* We learn that of students who drink, eleven percent of the men and nine percent of the women began drinking between the ages of eleven and fifteen. Thirty-six percent of the men and forty-seven percent of the woman began in their sixteenth or seventeenth years. Fifty-three percent of the men and forty-four percent of the women began at eighteen or older.

Chapter Ten: *"High, Tight, and Drunk."* "Tight" is defined as "Unsteadiness in ordinary physical activities, or noticeable aggressiveness, or over-solicitousness, or loss of control over social amenities or of verbal accuracy, or slight nausea." Twenty percent of the men and fifty-one percent of the women report that they have never been tight. Twenty-five percent of the men and thirty two percent of the women report that they have been tight from one to five times. Eighteen percent of the men and nine percent of the girls report being tight from six to fifteen times; seventeen percent of the men and four percent of the girls, from sixteen to fifty times. For from fifty-one to one hundred times, the percentage of women is negligible and that of men is five percent. Finally, four percent of the men report being "tight" a hundred times or more; and eleven percent of the men and four percent of the women report having been tight "at times," but do not state the frequency.

And then come the table reporting on those who have been *drunk*, which is defined as "an overstepping of social expectancies (short of completely passing out), loss of control in ordinary physical activities, and inability to respond to reactions of others." Thirty-eight percent of the men and eighty-two percent of the women report that this has occurred

once; and eight percent of the men and one percent of the women report that it occurred from six to ten times. Beyond that the percentage of women is again negligible, but five percent of the men report having been drunk from eleven to twenty times, and four percent of the men and one percent of the women report that on occasion they "have been drunk," but do not state the frequency.

And then the most advanced stage, *Passing Out.* The number of those who report this as having happened "once" is sixteen percent for men, seven percent for women. "Twice" is eight percent for men, one percent for women. More than twice, one percent of women drinkers and nine percent of the men.

The book reveals that seventy-nine percent of the men and sixty-five percent of the women had their first drink before entering college. With regard to parents drinking, ninety-two percent of the men report that both of their parents used alcohol; eighty-three percent of the women report the same.

I invite all parents to examine the statement which follows: "When both parents drink, eighty-three percent of the female students are drinkers, compared with a mere twenty-three percent with both parents abstain. These data suggest that parental example is a factor of major significance in drinking by young people."

Remember, then, that seventy-four percent of our college youth are now "social" and "moderate" drinkers. Imagine that one of every sixteen of them will be an alcoholic. Remind yourself that one out of every five or nine will be a "problem drinker." You will go with these facts to the young people you know, and you will warn them and plead with them.

And I can tell you now what many will say: "But drinking is a *custom.* Everybody in my fraternity (sorority, class) does it. If you don't you're a freak!"

Fortunately, the authors of *Drinking in College* delved into this problem as well. And Table 95 in their book, headed "Attitude Toward Abstainers," tells quite clearly what happens to one socially if he does not drink in college.

If the student abstains, and makes no special point about it, fifty-four percent of his fellow-students will have feelings of admiration, approval and respect for him. Forty percent will be indifferent to his position. Four percent will feel resentment, scorn, disapproval or derogation. Two percent will feel pity.

Thus, among every ten of his classmates, there will be nine who either do not care or feel real admiration for the student who does not drink. Just one will feel scorn or pity.

And what about the girls who abstains from liquor? In this case, thirty-two percent of her fellow-students will not care at all. Sixty-two percent will admire, approve and respect her. And again, four percent will feel hostility; and two percent, pity. Almost two-thirds of the women will think the *better* of the girl who does not drink!

These are the figures which the brewers and the distillers fear! These are the figures which make them spend a quarter of a billion dollars a year to show that liquor is essential to salesmen, their advertising experts and their publicists, their copywriters and their artists deem it important to introduce their product "to a high percentage of the younger generation."

They know that more than half the country admires the men and the women who do not fall for the lies of their advertisements nor the lies of their product.

———————————

This article is reprinted with permission from *The Cup of Fury,* Copyright 1956 by Upton Sinclair. Published at $3.00 by Channel Press, Inc., Great Neck, New York.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

MINISTRY AND RESTORATION

By W. Carl Ketcherside

The vitality and spiritual virility of the primitive community of saints stemmed from its implementation of the divinely ordained principle of mutual ministry. Each member of the community had been added to it as the result of his experience in establishing a personal covenant relationship with the Father, through his Son Jesus Christ. This experience involved a crucifixion of the old self (Rom. 6:5). The individual died, and his life was hid with Christ in God (Col 3:3). The result was expressed in this fashion, "I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me" (Gal. 2:20) .

These saints did not regard their relationship as a way of life, but as *life itself.* They were not troubled about the philosophy of life which they should adopt, for they had been adopted, and were themselves the living embodiment of Him who was both the power and *the wisdom* of God. They were not so much philosophers, as they were a living philosophy —a philosophy demonstrated, manifest, and apparent to all who look upon them. Since they had died and now the Christ lived in them, they were in the world for the same reason he had come into it. That purpose was stated by Jesus in these words, "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28). Since this was the motive of Jesus in coming, and since he now dwells in the saints, the life we now live must be one of ministration to others, and of giving even life itself. This must be the status of all who are in Him, not of a select few, a trained segment, or an elite corps!

We live in a decadent age of religion. The stream of Christian thought, in its onward flow through the centuries, has accumulated a great deal of sediment. The shape of the original concept has been greatly altered by the friction endured in its contact with the abrasives of human desires and determinations. The response of the thirsty soul to God is now made on the basis of "the plan of salvation", illustrated by a kitchen stepladder arrangement on the blackboard, in which the individual steps off the lower rung of faith as quickly as he got on it, and is forced to take a third ritualistic step called "confession" which has been inserted by the simple expedient of wresting certain scriptures from their context. No longer do we come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, and enter into personal covenant relationship through faith in Jesus, validated by our submission to baptism, but we become members of an organization, instead of becoming partakers in a divine organism. The greatest surrender we are called upon to make, is not of the life to Jesus, but of our freedoms, prerogatives and rights to *a System*—inaugurated, perpetuated, and administered by men, but arrogantly demanding conformity in the name of Jesus.

The System, which has borrowed the livery of heaven, and appropriated and exalted as an official title, a simple descriptive term employed by the Holy Spirit, seeks, as do all human arrangements, to immortalize itself by resistance to all criticism and revolution. To achieve this end, it holds over the heads of its members the threat of excommunication, ostracism and boycott. And, as is characteristic of all such organizations functioning as usurpers in the spiritual realm, it has a vocabulary of its own, calculated to deceive the uninitiated and unwary, by employment of innocent terms which are equated in harmony with the partisan position.

"The truth" becomes the arbitrary interpretation placed upon the sacred scriptures; "preaching the gospel" is equivalent to parroting the party line, often from traditional outlines collected and classified in books; "Bible baptism" is immersion administered by a preacher (clergyman) in good standing with the party; "restoration" is defending the present status of the party by bending scriptures to justify what is done; and "entering the ministry" is not enlisting in the service of Christ, but going away to a theological school maintained by *The System* to prepare a clergy who will conform to party programs and become part of a pressure group to stifle original thinking and quell revolt against legalism.

In no other field is the divergence of *The System* from the practice of the primitive community of saints, more clearly apparent, than in the concept of ministry. Current expressions such as "hiring a minister," "firing a minister," "graduate minister," "assistant minister," "retirement from the ministry," etc., were not only no part of the vocabulary of the Holy Spirit, but the connotation of the terms was wholly foreign to the community of God. Thoughtless, superficial students of the new covenant scriptures frequently urge that

"mutual ministry" is not found in the sacred writings. It is important that we examine this claim without hesitancy or quibbling.

1. IS "MUTUAL MINISTRY" SCRIPTURAL?

The King James translators render the words of Paul in Romans 1:12, "For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be established, that is, that I may be comforted together with you by the mutual faith both of you and me." The RSV has it, "That we may be mutually encouraged by each other's faith, both yours and mine." This is important because it shows that the word "mutual" denotes a reciprocal action. It is not "one toward others," but it is "each toward the other." The same word that is translated "mutual" in this place is 76 times rendered "one another." The lexicons define the original with the terms, "one another, reciprocally, mutually."

In 1 Peter 4:10 we read, "As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God." This passage regulates the use of gifts which may be employed for the welfare of the community. The instruction is to every man. It embraces the proper utilization of every gift. God bestows no useless gifts. His grace is many-sided. It is reflected in diverse ways and means. But those who are recipients and possessors of gifts are stewards, and as such must render an account to the Master. To be good stewards, those entrusted with a gift, must minister the same one to another, that is, mutually. Here is "mutual ministry" and it is authorized by the God of heaven.

Those who oppose this clear instruction and are exponents and defenders of *The System,* which purports to be the church of God, seek by devious forms of argument to offset the teaching of the Spirit. Many who glibly quote the succeeding verse, which is but an exposition of this one, deny the applicability of the passage under consideration, to our present state. They wave it lightly aside by making it appear that it belonged only to the miraculous age, and the gifts to be ministered mutually are no longer obtainable, so the regulation for employment of the gifts of the holy ones has been abrogated.

This shallow reasoning is the refuge of those who have "an axe to grind," and who are more interested in keeping what they have, than in restoring what God has authorized. The word *charisma* simply means "a favor which one receives without any merit of his own." It may be either a natural or supernatural gift. In either case it is from God, for "every good gift and every perfect gift is from above and cometh down from the Father of lights." The word is applied to the natural gift of continence, which enabled Paul to be free from the compulsion of sexual desire, and thus to remain unmarried (1 Cor. 7:7). He calls it a gift from God.

Supernatural gifts belong to the supernatural age of the community of the Christ, natural gifts belong to a natural age of administration. But the regulation for employment of the gifts of God does not change, and all such are to be ministered mutually, according to the ability bestowed by God. To attempt to deprive many gifted ones in the community from exercise of their abilities, and set up a system which would make such exercise impossible, and to do so on the basis that God removed the right to use gifts he now bestows, when he changed the method of bestowal, is to tamper with divine prerogatives in a manner which should make those shudder who are guilty of doing so. Certainly, if when men were directly endowed by the Spirit, all were to minister, it would be presumptuous to assert that since none are directly endowed, one may assume to do it all.

2. SCOPE OF MUTUAL MINISTRY

What was to be done mutually, or reciprocally, in the primitive community of the saints? In his wonderful thesis on the unified functioning of the divine organism, the apostle Paul points out that there are varieties of gifts, service, and working, although proceeding from the one source. The purpose of the gifts is thus described, "To each is given a manifestation of the Spirit for the common good" (1 Cor. 12:7). Here are a few of the mutual aspects pertaining to "the common good."

1. *Love*. "Beloved, let us love one another, for love is of God" (1 John 4:9).

2. *Hospitality*. "Use hospitality one to another without grudging" (1 Pet. 4:9).

3. *Forbearance*. "With longsuffering, forbearing one another in love" (Eph. 4:2).

4. *Forgiveness*. "Be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, for giving one another" (Eph. 4:32)

5. *Comfort*. "Wherefore comfort one another with these words" (1 Thess. 4:18) .

6. *Edification*. "Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another" (Rom. 14:19).

7. *Exhortation*. "Exhort one another daily" (Heb. 3:13).

8. *Teaching and Admonition*. "Teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" (Col. 3:16) .

9. *Care*. "The members should have the same care one for another" (1 Cor. 12:25).

10. *Confession of faults*. "Confess your faults one to another, and pray for one another" (James 5:16) .

11. *Service.* "By love serve one another" (Gal. 5:13).

12. *Burden bearing*. "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ" (Gal. 6:2)

Although, a community when newly planted, would be nurtured and nourished by the evangelist who begot them by the gospel, such a one, like a father, would train the new converts in every phase of service. He would seek to make them capable of doing without

his presence, so he could be on with his primary task of taking the Good News to those who had not previously heard it. Every member would be given full opportunity to exercise and develop his ability, and the evangelist would work himself out, rather than work himself in. The goal of the infant community was to reach maturity, to stand upon its own feet, to further the cause without help. They had been called to minister, not to be ministered unto.

When men among their own number had attained the qualifications required of bishops, or pastors, these were selected by the community, ordained by the evangelist, and under their oversight, the community functioned as an independent unit. The evangelist was no longer required. His work with the congregation had been finished. To suggest that such a community "hire a minister" to conduct their corporate devotions, carry on instruction in exhortation and admonition, visit their sick, and administer their communal affairs, would have been an insult, a reflection against their growth in grace and knowledge, and an implication that they were still in a state of infantile weakness and incompetency. The measure of growth in one congregation of saints, is found in the words of the apostle Paul, addressed to them, "I am persuaded of you, my brethren, that ye also are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another."

Mutual ministry applies to every phase of life and activity in the community of the holy ones. It utilizes for the common good every gift, talent, or ability, within the regulation of the apostolic doctrine. It is not limited to the public corporate worship of the community, nor does it exclude it. It does not make a majority of the saints a mere paying membership whose chief function is to provide a stipend for one to minister unto them, but it recognizes that all are ministers without exception, and the term "ministry" is an inclusive one which describes every act and function by which God and man are served.

3. RELATION TO RESTORATION

Every honest researchist in the history of the ancient community of God, is forced to admit that mutual ministry was the very basis of communal life, and the reason for the rapid spread and conquests of Christianity. Why, then, those who claim to be laboring for restoration of the primitive order, show such disinterest in, and often manifest such open hostility to, the recapture of this concept? We cite a few factors which we consider pertinent to any attempt to answer.

1. *Unbelief.* There are those who freely admit that mutual ministry was the secret of the strength and growth of the primitive community. They acknowledge that "the saints, with the bishops and deacons," constituted the local community, and the modern "located minister" was no more a part of the divine arrangement, than was an archbishop or pope. But they hasten to say that God's plan will no longer work. In this age of complexity and perplexity, we must reverse the order of heaven and teach the disciples that they come "to

be ministered unto, and not to minister." The simple ministry ordained by God is not adapted to a gadget world of slot machines where you turn a knob to indicate what you want, then drop your money in to get it, so "the minister" must be selected by the trial sermon method. Thus, we are treated to the sordid spectacle of performers passing across the stage, exhibiting their wares, and turning on their charm, like bathing beauties in a contest, hoping for the nod from the judges on the sidelines, hearts beating with trepidation while the elders make their decision.

Those who begin with the premise that God's way is outmoded and impossible, forfeit all right to be regarded as restorationists. They are actually enemies of restoration. They will oppose it with the bitterness and animosity of a wildcat defending the cub to which it gave birth. It is only those who feel a compulsion to adopt and implement the ideal of God, those who are not legislators or inventors of schemes and systems of their own, but who trust in God and labor under the earnest conviction that He who said His ways were not the ways of men, will no more allow His way to fail, than he will allow His word to return unto Him void, who may be truly called restoration-minded. This is the way of faith!

2. Party spirit. This work of the flesh (Gal. 5:20) is a motivating factor for much that is done in the religious realm. It is subtle and cunning, worming itself into the hearts of the believers, and beguiling even the strongest with a hundred innocent guises. It is apparent in every propaganda move which attempts to spur communicants to greater contributions and outlays on the basis of comparison or contrast with other factions or sects.

Promoters of *The System,* which has generally supplanted the movement for restoration of the primitive order in our generation, are especially adept at exploitation of the party spirit. They seek to wring shekels from the purses of the members to maintain their benevolent and eleemosynary institutions and societies by appeal to what the Roman Catholics are doing with their orphanages; they stimulate interest in their television and radio programs, and solicit funds to be sent to the national headquarters for these communication media, by citing the per capita gifts of Seventh Day Adventists. They spur up flagging zeal in foreign missions by contrasting the paucity of their own efforts with those of the Baptist and Methodist organizations. The laggards are whipped into line through fear psychosis. "The Baptist will get 'em, if you don't watch out!"

All such incitements are fatal to the genius and spirit of the Christian faith. They place relationship to the Christ upon the basis of sectarian competition, and although we may by such devious and ill-contrived means build another sect, and a more successful one than others, we do a great disservice to our Lord and his cause by such undesirable motivations. The party spirit spawns factional pride. We dare not be outdone in popular appeal. We must erect edifices as great as those about us; we must at least match, and surpass if possible, the ritualistic performance of our rivals. This demands a "minister" to serve as our front man, one who is skilled in the art of public presentation, a dramatic actor upon

the speaker's platform, attired in the height of fashion, driving a car of the latest model, a good mixer, a social person who will bring honor to us. And some who ought to worship God are soon diverted to the worship of a man.

In such an atmosphere of haughtiness and vainglory, the modest unassuming ministry of the primitive community of holy ones, cannot thrive. Fashionable communicants who keep one eye on God and the other on their religious neighbors, to see how they are being impressed, may pay lip service to the apostles, but would not permit one of those fishermen to "occupy the pulpit." The blackened, needle-pricked fingers of a tent-maker would hardly adorn one of our cathedrals. So the humble ones are relegated to a menial position where their voices can never be raised in the assembly to edify or exhort one another. The right to speak now belongs only to a professional who performs the task for a fee.

4. WHAT IS THE REMEDY?

Those who are concerned about recapturing the spirit and essence of pure Christianity, cannot sit idly by and know that the ideal of God is still enshrouded by the mists of human philosophy. They must be impelled by an overwhelming urge to dispel the clouds and unveil the beauty of the divine arrangement. But what can be done to offset the influence of entrenched power, pelf, and prestige? Does anyone dare to face the storm of ridicule, venom and hate which will be unleashed against him? Can he endure misrepresentation, malignant whispering and malicious attack? The Roman hierarchy, confusing itself with "the Church" has rendered itself impervious to attack by the parishioners, who have been taught that opposition to the priestcraft, regardless of venality, is a betrayal of the Christ. In the same fashion, *The System*, which equates itself with the New Testament church, seeks to make it appear that those who criticize it are enemies of truth, and in conflict with our Lord.

The problem we face is a major one. It is intensified by the fact that mutual ministry runs counter to the laziness, indifference and sloth, which characterize many who would rather pay a man to serve God in their stead. It is unappealing to the pride of a professional caste whose craft will be endangered. There is no easy solution by which we can slough off the dross and restore the original ideal. We do humbly suggest a few points for consideration.

1. The sincere preachers of the Good News, who have been unwitting victims of *The System*, should recognize that the position which they hold as "the minister" of a congregation is without warrant or sanction in the sacred scriptures. It is but a humanly devised pastor system under disguise. They should retain a vision of their real mission, which is not to remain a nursemaid for deliberately retarded, puling spiritual infants, who refuse to learn to feed themselves, but to take the Good News to those not yet in the fold.

2. Those who are bishops, and thus, are God's pastors, should confess their failings and shortcomings in the past, and begin at once to act in conformity with the dignity and seriousness which becomes this sacred function. They should go among the sheep, gently leading, teaching, feeding, and be ever on the alert for those gifts which have been latent and dormant, but which can be called into use.

3. The saints who read these words should gird themselves for renewed effort and responsibility. Every one of you is a minister. Everyone is a priest of God. Begin to serve and to sacrifice. Each one should study, seek and search, and be ever watchful for the means by which he can strengthen and encourage his fellows. "Follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another." Be longsuffering, forbearing and patient with those who do their best, yet whose efforts are feeble. We must learn to crawl before we can walk!

4. All of us should come to know the depth of responsibility which is attached to a state of covenant relationship with The Eternal One. As ancient Israel heard the words of God thundered from the darkened brow of Sinai, and said, "All that the Lord has commanded us will we do," so let us at the foot of the mount which cannot be touched, affirm our intention to be faithful to the covenant which is sanctified by the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel.

W. Carl Ketcherside is a publisher of religious literature and Editor of *Mission Messenger,* 2360 Gardner Dr., St. Louis 21, Mo.

MORAL CONSCIOUSNESS

No one of us can be utterly free from a sense of shame while bigotry, intolerance and factionism exist in the name of religion. We are Christian, and the rents and tears in the Christian fabric reflect against us all, as surely as injustice, inequality and cruelty to human beings in any part of the earth reflect against us as human beings. We cannot disavow our responsibility by arrogantly inquiring if we are keepers of our brethren. We cannot, like Pilate, wash our hands, and be free of the guilt of the mangled body of Jesus, so long as we have made no attempt to pour in ointment, and bind up the wounds.—W. Carl Ketcherside, *Mission Messenger,* Vol 20, No. 12, p. 1.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

MY DREAM OF THE RESTORED CHURCH

By Leroy Garrett

Man must dream before his dream can come true. Religion should be sufficiently liberal and inspirational to provide ample motivation for man's imagination. It is as a creature of wonder that man is distinct from the animal, and it is through imaginative anticipation that man lifts himself to better ways of doing things.[1] He has the power to picture in his mind what *might be*. Imagination makes man a creator of ideas. He can transcend what is with a view of discovering what *ought* to be.[2]

This essay is a venture of the mind into the potential of the church of Christ on earth. It is a dream of what the kingdom of God might mean to men and women who live in times of stress. And yet it is a dream that does not overlook the human element, for even dreamers cannot expect perfection in any situation that involves the frailty of man. Neither does this dream neglect the divine element, for every dreamer in Zion must realize that God has spoken and that his word must form the basis of any imaginative picture of a better church. We agree with the psalmist that "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." The Bible cannot be improved upon, and the constitution of the kingdom of God stands inviolate. Yet man as a creative genius can so involve himself in the sacred oracles as to rise above mediocrity in religion. He can shake himself free from the shackles of traditionalism and the impediments of institutionalism and thus stand upon holy ground. Here he can envisage the tabernacle of God as it is revealed in the divine economy.

If man can improve his physical condition by probing deeper and deeper into the elements of the universe, he may be able to gain richer spiritual insight by a continual search for the kingdom of God. The wonders of the word of God may be as magnanimous and multitudinous as the wonders of the universe. Man has begun his venture into space. The possibilities are illimitable. One scientist stated recently that man's work in outer space will someday make the present modes of communication as outdated as the Indian smoke signals now are.[3] Yet all these things are by virtue of man's imagination. The Bible is likewise the work of God. It may be that we have only begun to *see* its economy, for it may be as immeasurable as the universe with its billions of stars. David could say, "Thy testimonies are full of wonder," and Paul affirmed, "O the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and how inscrutable his ways!"[4]

The scientist alluded to above also stated that man's present relationship to outer space is like the relationship of an ocean fish to the world about him. The fish that can view the world only through the pale ocean waters has a very narrow conception of the nature of the

world. Even should the fish grow a periscope so that he could see above water and behold the shapes and colors of the earth, his concept would still be too restricted. Man in his venture into space has thus far only managed to get a better look. He is barely above water and he hardly knows what it is all about.[5]

Could this be our relationship to the Bible? The psalmist speaks of the word of God as "the finding of great spoil." It may be that we have hardly begun to see what the "great spoil" means to us. As Paul anticipates the conversion of the Jews he says, "If their trespass means riches for the world, and if their failure means riches for the Gentiles, how much more will their full inclusion mean!"[6] How much more the riches! Here Paul is imagining what it might mean to the world for the Jews to be converted. Think of what the Jews could do in helping us to appreciate the "great spoil" of the Old Testament!

It is surely a fact that we have much to learn regarding the nature of the church of Jesus Christ. We have long committed the sin of over-simplification. This study is an effort to complexify the situation sufficiently that we will be able to see that the restoration of New Testament Christianity is far from accomplished, especially in regards to the "spirit" of the ancient order. We hope to point out new areas of investigation and to evaluate some of our present practices.

THE NECESSITY OF DIVERSITY

If Paul could say, "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit," he could also say, "There are diversities of personalities, but the same Spirit." God created us to be different. Just as we are different in physical makeup, no two of us being exactly alike, we are also different psychologically. Some of us are more poetic and imaginative than others of us; some are more practical and pessimistic, while others are more idealistic and sanguine. It is just as certain that we are going to think differently as it is that our physical features are different.[7]

We have erred in supposing that the united church of Christ will be composed of people who would think alike in religious matters. Consequently our plea has not been for unity but for conformity. We have sought to *conform* people to our own narrow interpretations rather than to *unite* them as the diversified body of Christ. This is partly due to a misinterpretation of such passages as 1 Cor. 1:10, where Paul urges the disciples at Corinth to "speak the same thing and be of the same mind and same judgment." Inasmuch as Paul elsewhere in the same letter provides for diversity of expression (1 Cor. 9:4-11, 14:26-33), he could not mean that disciples are to be of the same opinion about everything. Paul explains in verse 12 what he means by insisting on agreement. The Corinthian church was split into factions, at least in sentiment, and so some were saying "1 belong to Paul" while others were crying "I belong to Cephas" or "I belong to Christ," The "Christ party" was as

wrong as the others, for they were all *a plea for a party.* In Moffatt's translation of this passage he gives "Stop these party crys!" for "all of you speak the same thing,"[8] The man who wrote Romans 14 could never have said "it is necessary that all disciples see everything alike," A study of Romans 14 will reveal that Paul understood that there will be differences of opinion. Paul here teaches that we are to "welcome the man who is weak in faith, though not for disputes over opinions," and "it is before his own master that he stands or falls (regarding his opinions)," When Paul says "The faith you have, keep between yourself and God" he had reference to different interpretations of scripture. Even though one brother is a vegetarian and another is carnivorous, they are to welcome each other into fellowship and not pass judgment on each other, says Paul. This being true, 1 Cor. 1:10 could not possibly be an injunction against differences of opinion. While we are to be loyal to our plea that Christ is Lord, thus avoiding party spirits and sectarian crys, we cannot expect to attain unanimity upon all matters of interpretation. If this is insisted upon, we may attain *conformity,* but not *unity.*

In my dream the disciples view diversity of interpretation as wholesome. They encourage disagreement rather than discourage it. They think it desirable that a brother think for himself and search for better and more satisfactory interpretations. Never will they needle a brother with such jabs as "Why, that's Roman Catholicism!" or "You ought to join the sects!" In my dream a brother feels at ease with his fellow saints despite differences. He does not hesitate to express himself fully and freely, for he knows that his brethren will show forbearance regardless of how far afield he might get. This in no wise implies indifference to doctrine or an attitude of "anything goes," but it does mean that every saint moves in an atmosphere of freedom, and he does not feel he will be "withdrawn from" if he gets off the beaten path. The saints insist that all differences be the result of sincere inquiry into the word of God, thus eliminating the sectarian spirit. An idea that grows out of a humble search for truth is worthy of unlimited forbearance, but any idea that is postulated with the intention of forming a party is essentially factious and will not be tolerated.

Unity is diverse by its very nature. The "unity of the Spirit" does not entail everyone seeing everything alike, but it implies a *togetherness* despite the differences. The primitive church was shockingly diverse, yet it did well in maintaining "the unity of the Spirit." Philosophers define beauty[9] as "unity in diversity." This is what makes a snowfall so lovely. Every flake is different and the wintry setting is diverse, and yet there is unity in it all. A congregation has that simple beauty when it attains unity in diversity. A church can have a thousand differences within it and still be united. It is not differences that cause division. It is the party spirit.

My dream church does not believe in conformity, for this implies compliance to set patterns. This is why a creed, either written or unwritten, is ruled out. This also rules out the "kangaroo court." Unity in Christ is one thing; conformity to clerical poppy-cock is something else. The ideal ekklesia will not have "the brother with the tape recorder" who wishes to preserve what "the digressive" has to say so that he can *get* him when the time comes. There will be no secret caucuses where brethren frame up on a recalcitrant. Brethren will quit crucifying each other in the name of sound doctrine.

My Utopian church will likewise see the necessity of diversity on a congregational level, realizing that it is neither possible or desirable for congregations to be alike in every respect. Even if the differences reveal that somebody is wrong, there can still be unity. One congregation may support the missionary society and use instrumental music, while the other could not conscientiously do either. One church maintains the "pastor system" and has a Sunday School organization, while another church could not possibly practice either. There may be differences even in denominational (by this I refer only to *name)* appellation. Some congregations may choose to use the term "Church of Christ" principally, while others use "Christian Church" or "Disciples of Christ" principally—or even "the Church of the Firstborn" or perhaps "Synagogue of the Messiah" if they are Jewish!

Not enough of us have learned that we can enjoy Christian fellowship with people who are *wrong* in some of their beliefs and practices. But my dream church has no difficulty in welcoming those who are wrong. Since God loved us and gave his Son for us when we were wrong, we too can embrace those who are wrong. Ignorance becomes intolerable only when it is voluntary. This does not mean that the Utopian church will not have its strong convictions to which it clings uncompromisingly. Nor does it mean that there will be no steps taken to correct error. It will surely "contend for the faith once for all delivered to the saints." It only means that it will move within a framework of love, that it will teach the truth in a spirit of charity, and that it will not wait until a person is right on every thing before he is received into its fellowship. The saints will seek to unite themselves with him in Christ, not conform him to themselves.

WHAT NAME?

Even though naming has been a problem since Adam, I have no difficulty on this score in my dream. Any sectarian appellation will only tend to keep God's people divided. There must be considerable flexibility here, for there is a score of scriptural terms that the restored church can use for the sake of identification. Saints of God should learn to use a denominational term (to be distinguished from a *sectarian name)* with meaning. They will think of themselves as *members* as they relate themselves to the body of Christ, and they will call themselves *disciples* as they think of themselves as students of the Master. They are *saints* in their relationship to the world and they are citizens in reference to the

kingdom of God. They are children of God in the heavenly family and they are *the royal priesthood* in respect to the altar of God.

They may even be called presbyterian in government and methodist in function, and certainly they are baptists in that they immerse and episcopalians in that they are ruled by bishops. But no descriptive term should become a special name for the children of God. The church is certainly *catholic* in that it is universal in scope, but it is neither Roman or Greek Catholic. It is *apostolic,* but not the Apostolic Church; it is holy, but it is not the Holiness Church. It is Christ's, but it is not the Church of Christ; it is Christian, but it is not the Christian Church. It is adventist, but it is not the Adventist Church; it is the salvation army, but not the Salvation Army Church.

My dream church has no name at all, which leaves it free to use any and all meaningful descriptive terms that are found in the New Testament. Thus a dividing wedge is removed and unity is brought a step nearer.

Yet we must be realistic. What is one to say when he is asked about his church affiliation? In whose account are the deacons to deposit the money at the local bank? In what name will property be held in trust? These questions arose in a meeting of a newly formed congregation that I attended recently. These brethren saw a difference between a name that identifies a group with a particular sectarian persuasion and one that describes the nature of the congregation and the location of its place of meeting. After some discussion this group decided to identify their building as the Westside Christian Chapel, while they themselves would be called disciples, a congregation of Christians, and any or all other scriptural terms. It was further suggested that in their advertising they would employ such language as "A Congregation of the Restoration Movement," which would explain its function in respect to other Christian, communities.

Since this matter is within the area of expediency there can be many different ways of identifying the Lord's work in a community. The synagogues of the New Testament period may be suggestive along this line. The *nature* of the congregation (that is, racial or geographic peculiarities) would often determine its name. In Acts 6:9 synagogues in Jerusalem are referred to as having such names as the synagogue of the Freedmen, synagogue of the Cyrenians, and the synagogue of the Alexandrians. The first one was a congregation made up principally of Jews who had won their freedom from slavery, while the other two were called after the geographic locations from which the people came. These were not official *names* in the sense that Baptist or Methodist are, for they were probably no more than nicknames given for the purpose of distinguishing one group from another.[10]

It is likely that those synagogues that accepted Christianity were dubbed "the synagogue of the Messiah," for James 2:2 indicates that believing Jews continued to use the term synagogue and Acts 28:22 shows that the Christian movement was at first thought of as within the milieu of Judaism.[11] That Acts 28:22 speaks of the believers as a

'sect" (compare Acts 24:5 where it reads "sect of the Nazarenes") does not necessarily imply that the Jews used the term opprobriously. It would mean simply a *part* of Judaism. The scrolls from the Dead Sea show us that there were many sects within first century Judaism, and so Christianity, before it became independent, was considered one of them.[12] If Tertullian's reference to Paul as "a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes" is reproachful as it seems to be, it is because Christianity had become troublesome, and not because it was a *sect.*

Speaking of nicknames for a church or synagogue, it is probable that "Christian" was first given as a nickname; and maybe as a term of reproach, but not necessarily.[13] At least we know that no believer was called a Christian before the faith reached Antioch, where "the disciples were first called Christians," The synagogue of the Messiah in Jerusalem did not have a "Christian" in it! Stephen and James died without ever hearing the term! The believers were called disciples long before they were called Christians. Alexander Campbell, who spent much time debating this question of the name with Barton W. Stone and other restorationists, preferred the term disciple, while Stone insisted upon Christian. This explains why there were two movements in the early days of the Restoration, one called "Christians" and the other "Disciples," While Campbell believed that "Christian" was a nickname rather than God-given, he based his contention on the idea that "disciple" is a humbler term and more descriptive of, the man who is searching for the truth.[14]

That the term "Christian" may be a nickname in no wise implies that it is not a meaningful term. The New Testament and early Christian literature generally indicates that the name was accepted by the believers. One passage mentions that they "glorified God in this name" (1 Pet. 4:16). My point is that this name cannot be made compulsory of all those who accept the Lord. The Jews, for instance, might prefer to use "Messianists" rather than "Christians," which is essentially a Greek term. Jews would not have to surrender their Jewishness in becoming believers. It is significant that the Greek name "Christian" came only after the movement left its Jewish home and became Hellenistic.[15] A Jewish synagogue today would not have to become a "Christian church" in order to be faithful to the New Covenant scriptures.[16] It could simply become "a synagogue of the Messiah" and its members would continue to be saints or children of God. If they chose to use a term equivalent to "Christian" and yet continue to preserve their Jewishness, which they would have the right to do, then they could call themselves "Messianists"—and instead of "Christianity" (a term that they might justly object to) they might speak of their work of the Lord as "Messianic Judaism!"

I might conclude this part of my dream by stating that a simple way of naming our congregations would be by location, such as "Riverside Congregation" or "Maplewood Assembly" or "Bethany Chapel." In my hometown of Jacksonville a Methodist congrega-

tion is commonly referred to as “Grace Church” while another is called “Centenary Church,” This is not sectarian nor divisive as is the name Methodist. While I have in a note offered some objection to the term “church,” I can otherwise refer to such a practice as part of a dream come true.

ARCHITECTURE OF THE BUILDING

The design of the meetinghouse is an important aspect of Restoration, for the building, like a family dwelling, reflects the nature of the work that goes on there and the attitude of those who worship there. It is folly to suppose that the saints need no place of meeting, that they need only a rented hall or space in some private home. It is true that the New Testament speaks often of “the church in your house,” but there are good reasons why the primitive saints did not erect houses for public meetings. One reason was persecution, which made impossible the erection of buildings; another was poverty. Still another reason may have been that they believed the world would soon come to an end and that the Lord would soon return to claim his own. Buildings began to appear once it became apparent that the world order had some permanency and when the yoke of Roman persecution was lifted.[17]

One of the problems with earlier Restoration efforts in America was the laxness of disciples in erecting adequate meetinghouses. The revolutionary spirit of the times led many to conclude that houses were not necessary, or at least they felt it was in order to be as indifferent to buildings as were the New Testament saints. In his earlier travels among newly-formed disciple congregations, Alexander Campbell often complained that so little progress was being made in erecting comfortable and commodious buildings. It was necessary that most of his addresses be given in borrowed buildings.

As late as 1834 he wrote the following concerning meeting-houses:

> It cannot be doubted by those who reflect upon all that operates upon the human mind, that convenient and comfortable houses for the public worship of Christian congregations, and for the accommodation of those who may be induced to visit their assemblies, is as necessary as private dwellings for our families and friends.
>
> He who wishes to enjoy domestic life and the sweets of social intercourse, provides himself, if in his power, with a house sufficiently commodious. If congregations wish to prosper and increase, they must have some place in which to assemble, and to which to invite those whom they desire to see partakers of the blessings and honors of the family of God.
>
> We must erect a stand on which to place the lamp, if we would have ourselves or others to enjoy its light. We must not complain that our worship is not attended, nor our discourses and admonitions heard, if there be no provision for hearers or attendants. Places of meeting are just as necessary as paper and ink for the spread of truth. But as this is

> almost universally admitted, we proceed to ask why is it that Christians are so remiss in contributing for this good work?[18]

After over a century of disciple history the problem of meeting-houses has changed radically. We are no longer remiss in erecting buildings; yea, we sometimes build a house before we have a congregation! The problem now is erecting buildings that are out of character with the spirit of Restoration. My dream congregation has a building that is in harmony with "the meekness and gentleness" of the Christian profession and which is conducive to an active program of a priestly congregation. I shall spell out the character of such a building.

1. *It should be simple.* The New Testament warns us against those "who want to make a good showing in the flesh" (Gal. 6:12) . Pride takes its toll in modern concepts of "church architecture." The well-dressed person is one who is so clothed that he does not call attention to himself. He is not over-dressed nor under-dressed, but dressed with dignity and simplicity. Once you are away from such a person you probably could not recall the manner of his dress. So it is with a church house. It serves its purpose as a *house* and not as a show piece or as the latest word in architecture. It does not call attention to itself, unless it be for its neatness and cleanliness. It is neither crude nor ostentatious. Its simplicity discourages pride, its dignity encourages orderliness.

2. *It should be commodious, conveniently located, and of moderate cost.* A congregation should form some idea of how large it wants to grow. Once it reaches this size, plans can be laid for the starting of another congregation. It is wasteful to tear down a durable building so as to erect a larger one. Let a church erect a permanent, moderately priced building of simple construction that will meet its needs for generations. Once the group is too large for that building, let them swarm and start another congregation. While this cannot be made an arbitrary rule, it should be more generally practiced than it is. My dream church has a rather small building.

I cannot envisage a truly restored congregation as being very large. I will venture to say that no congregation of the Restoration Movement should permit itself to exceed two hundred members. I will give reasons for this later in my dream. So I would suggest that a new congregation think of itself as eventually growing to an assembly of two hundred persons (even this may be too large), and they can plan their building accordingly, with no idea of ever building another one. It should be commodious, which will mean that some room will be reserved for visitors and special occasions. It will be durable, which means that the money that ordinarily goes into fragile adornments will be used for deeper foundation and stouter materials.

Since Alexander Campbell was so conscious of the role of the building in the life of the ekklesia, it might be well to quote from him on this point.

> It is most devoutly to be wished that all who plead for reformation would carry out their principles in the plainness, convenience, and cheapness of the buildings which they erect for the assemblies of Christians. No greater satire could be inscribed on marble against the religion of Jesus Christ, than are many of the houses called churches, whenever the people have the means of gratifying the spirit which is in them.
>
> There is no difference between the Baptists and Other sects in this particular. Opulent communities among them have stately edifices, with lofty steeples and ponderous bells . . .
>
> Large, convenient, and permanent pauses may be built for generally less than half the sum usually expended on the same number of square feet. The Quakers are more exemplary in this matter than any other sect. But even their plan could still be improved.
>
> Let there be only a regard to convenience and durability; let all that is merely to gratify the lusts of the eye and the pride of life be left to them who seek to gain influence on the children of the flesh by reducing Christianity to the taste and fashion of this world, and we can build two, three, and sometimes four meeting houses for the price of one of the same dimensions . . ..
>
> For the sake of the humble founder of this our religion, and the author of our hope before God, let not the walls of the house, nor anything in it, reproach our profession.[19]

3. *It should be consistent with the principles of Restoration.* This will make the building of my dream church remarkably different from those of other churches. *There will be no pulpit*, for one principle of Restoration is the priesthood of all believers. Once all distinction between clergy and laity is erased, there will be no place for the "sacred desk" reserved for a professional minister. The assembly room will have the atmosphere of a large living room in a private home. There will be a table for the Lord's supper, around which at least two elders will be seated who will direct the service. The congregation will be seated informally in comfortable chairs very much like those found in the average home. There will be no pews and no such seating arrangement as is common in churches and theaters. The saints will be facing each other within a circle or semi-circle with the Lord's table at the center.[20]

This will encourage each saint to share in "the great conversation" of scriptural themes introduced by the elders or by some brother who is selected to lead the discussion. There will be no such thing as "preaching a sermon" in my dream church. Even "making a talk" will be a thing of the past. After all, brethren do not "make a talk" to each other in the privacy of their homes, but they rather share ideas together in a conversational way. In my dream congregation, therefore, the saints will assemble to break bread and to edify each other in an atmosphere that is conducive to easiness of self-expression. There is no artificiality or meaningless ritual. It has qualities of a family gathering for worship, where each one feels free to take part. This is another reason why the congregation must be kept small.

There will be the special occasions, of course, when a lecture will be given or when the gospel will be preached. Folding chairs will be set up and a lectern will be provided for such occasions. When one man is addressing a large group at *some* length, it is expedient to arrange the seating in the traditional style; but when the saints have assembled to edify each other, a more informal arrangement is in order. So my dream building will be flexible enough to suit varying conditions, thus making a valued distinction between an assembly of saints for worship and a public gathering for an evangelistic service.[21]

Sliding partitions in the main assembly room will provide smaller rooms for a library, counseling, small classes, and workshops. The basement will provide for further facilities, including sleeping quarters for sojourners. There will be a kitchen and social room, and these will be used very often, preferably every day and night by some group within the congregation. Love feasts will be a regular practice.[22] Neighbors will be frequent visitors. Brethren will spend *much* time with each other in social intercourse. Biblical problems will often be discussed over a cup of tea. It will be a meeting place for the young people. Mothers will try to get away from domestic duties to spend time with each other in the congregation's library.

An inexpensive baptistry will be placed in a small room in the basement, for most immersing would be performed privately and at odd times of the week. It could be more devotional and more easily accompanied by prayer and confession of sin if it were removed from the public eye.[23] Any member of the congregation might immerse a believer at any time, so the baptistry would be arranged so that this could be done easily and privately.

ORGANIZATION AND WORK

The work will be well organized with each member accepting his share of responsibility. One talented brother would serve as secretary to the congregation, and his responsibility would include keeping the archives. He would keep an exact record of business meetings, and he would maintain a history of the congregation. The history would be an exact account of the origin of the congregation, its charter members, and the vicissitudes through which it passes. A record will be kept of each member, including the date of his immersion, where he comes from or where he moves to, and whether he is in good standing. The archivist would preserve a copy of all documents, tracts, letters, and advertisements issued by the congregation through the years.[24]

The ekklesia would have both deacons and deaconesses as the New Testament provides for in 1 Timothy 3 and 5. These would watch out for the temporal needs of the congregation. They would be especially solicitous of the poor and the shut-ins. It would be their obligation to be alert to any good deeds the church might do in the community-at-large in a

humanitarian way. Both male and female deacons will direct workshops in which clothes are mended, furniture repaired, and things are made for distribution among the needy. They will maintain a depository of food and clothes to be distributed to the poor. Such workshops will give many in the congregation an opportunity to share in a different kind of mutual ministry.

The female deacons (or deaconesses) will be responsible for work among women and the aged where the peculiar talents of a woman is most needed. One could have regular appointments at homes for the aged and convalescent homes where she would busy herself with reading to the near-blind and writing letters for those too aged to write for themselves. Another deaconess could be supported in maintaining a home for orphans, while still another would conduct a home of hospitality for Christian young ladies who are away from home going to college or working.[25]

All members would be engaged in some type of ministry, each according to his ability (Rom. 12:6-8). Some will be especially devoted to youth work; others will choose to minister the word to those in hospitals. But all such work will be well organized so that there will be a minimum of lost motion and overlapping.

The church will encourage each to develop according to his ability. Some will be trained as evangelists and others as elders; still others will seek the office of teacher (Eph. 4:11-12). There will be special studies for this purpose. The ekklesia will in fact be a school. Its presbyters themselves will be competent instructors (1 Tim. 3:2), and they, along with other teachers (1 Cor. 12:28), would conduct a “church school” that would offer anything a young evangelist or Christian worker would need. This could include Greek, Hebrew, speech, church history, archaeology, religious philosophy, as well as the Bible or anything else that would lend to the special preparation of any scriptural work. But there will be no professional clergy.[26]

Yet the leaders of the congregation would encourage young men and women to get as good an education as each could afford in the public schools and in the colleges. But there would be no effort to establish schools for the express purpose of training people for offices within the ekklesia. My dream church honors the New Testament principle of “There is but one body” (Eph. 4:4), so it would have no sympathy with any idea of creating other institutions to do the work God has given to the body of Christ. While the elders would be friends to all educational institutions and encourage their patron age, they themselves would assume the task of providing spiritual training of the flock. (Acts 20:28) .

All the activity would be under the oversight of the elders or bishops of the congregation (1 Pet. 5:2). Another reason for a small congregation is that it makes it possible for the elders to know each sheep by name (John 10:3). The saints will respect the

elders for their work sake (1 Thess. 5:12). There will be no "clergyman" or "resident minister" around to eclipse them in their rightful place of dignity in the congregation. The elders might even be financially remunerated for their labor (1 Tim. 5:17) .[27]

ATTITUDE OF THE SAINTS

The ekklesia is a respected group within the life of the community. They are looked upon as part of the answer rather than part of the problem. The saints themselves have a wholesome attitude toward the community and the world. They even honor the rights of the infidel, perhaps to the point of paying taxes on their tax-free property, acknowledging that the infidel should not be asked to support religious institutions.[28]

My dream saints cooperate in the affairs of state. They pay taxes, vote, enter military service, serve on school boards, hold public office, and donate to the Red Cross, and yet they are kindly toward their brethren who would object to these things.

They are rather liberal in matters involving cooperation. They are enthusiastic about ecumenicity and are sympathetic with church unions and councils, and they might even send a "layman" to a meeting of a ministerial association. While they may be reticent to align themselves with such organizations as the National Council of Churches of Christ, their attitude is nonetheless sympathetic and positive.[29] They will cooperate to the straining point of their scruples, and they will not be separatists. They will have a good attitude toward other churches, acknowledging the good they do in the world and recognizing the spirituality of many of their members. They will invite the clergy into their assembly to address them on occasions, and they will warmly welcome any visitor to share in their discussions. The saints will feel free to attend other churches and, insofar as their consciences permit (there would be differences here) they would partake of the worship of these churches.[30]

In all this they would be adamant and militant about their own convictions and they would diligently propagandize their message of New Testament Christianity. But they will not be arbitrary or dogmatic. They will oppose false doctrine, condemn error, and warn of the wrath to come, but they will not act as if they were glad that everybody will go to hell but themselves. They will be a fellowship of love, and this love will be evident even to those who differ with them the most. They will practice the fine art of going the second mile and of doing some things that they do not particularly want to do. They will be idealistic but not impractical. They will build bridges of understanding between themselves and others. They will be able to listen to a Roman Catholic priest with a measure of objectivity and to pray fervently for the Methodist pastor who lives across the street. They can enter into a constructive conversation with an Adventist without feeling a

compulsion to crawl him on points of difference. In other words the saints of my dream church have some measure of emotional maturity.

They love the simple life. Their homes are modest. Their conversation is not everlastingly upon dress, fashion, houses, money, TV, and high prices. They learn to discuss the things that matter most. They are philosophers in that they are in constant search for the good life. They know the meaning of prayer. They learn that giving is a Christian grace, and the first gift they lay upon the altar of faith is themselves.

I awake from my dream to say that ideas are those little things that will not work *unless we work them*![31]

Leroy Garrett is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at MacMurray College, Jacksonville, Illinois.

1 Edmund W. Sinnott, "Imagination in Religion" in *Faculty Forum,* December, 1958, suggests that it is man's imagination that places him above animals. Man has two basic desires that are unusual. One is to possess things that are old and the other is to form wide perspectives. This is why he frequents historical places and gathers antiques, and it is why he scales mountains and builds picture windows in home. His imagination, striving to comprehend the mysteries of time and space, needs the help of his physical senses which enable him to see more deeply into both than he otherwise could. Religion is expressive of man's spiritual quest for truth. A pagan builds an idol because it helps his imagination to soar. For the Christian to perceive a spiritual deity in a material universe requires a supreme act of insight. Imagination makes this possible.

2 "Wonders are many, and none is more wonderful than man . . . speech, and wind-swift thought, and all the moods that mould a state, hath he taught himself . . . Cunning beyond fancy's dream in the fertile skill which brings him, now to evil, now to good. . . " (Sophocles, *Antigone)*

"For man, when perfected, is the best of animals, but, when separated from law and justice, he is the worst of all." (Aristotle, *Politics)*

"What a piece of work is man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals!" Shakespeare, *Hamlet.*

"Man is a person with considerable power of choice. In the light of 'what is' he says 'what ought to be.' His conscience, his sense of 'ought,' his eternal restlessness are the hope of mankind." Harold Titus, *Living Issues in Philosophy,* p. 129.

3 Arthur C. Clark in an address at MacMurray College.

4 Psalms 119:129, Romans 11:33.

5 A. B. C. Lovell, *The Individual and the Universe* (Oxford, 1959) computes that by a giant telescope man can see for a distance of two thousand million light years, yet "there is no indication that we are seeing anything but a small part of the total universe."

6 Romans 11:12.

7 George W. Crane, *Psychology Applied* (Chicago: Hopkins, 1956) has a chapter on "Individual and Sex Differences" that is worth reading in this connection.

8 James Moffatt, *The Moffatt New Testament Commentary* (New York: Harper, 1938).

9 Aristotle defined beauty as "symmetry, proportion, and an organic order of parts in a united whole." It is the cooperation of diverse parts to their whole. Cf. Will Durant, *The Pleasures of Philosophy* (New York: Simon-Schuster, 1953) chapter on "What Is Beauty?"

10 Lenski, *op cit.* p. 250, believes that Luke is referring to the people themselves when he uses the term *synagogue*, and not to the building. Some critics argue that believers were first active in the synagogues where some of the early struggles took place. They have Stephen going from synagogue to synagogue preaching the Messiah and a universal religion, while Paul, who is a member of the synagogue of the Cilicians, opposes him and leads the attack against him. The Talmud speaks of 480 synagogues in Jerusalem during the days of primitive Christianity. It is almost certain that the first believers, being Jews, would continue to work within the synagogues, and that at the beginning of Christianity they would be viewed by other Jews as simply another synagogue, I. e., another group of Jews with a different point of view.

11 The sources are legion that deal with Judaism as the *heimat* of early Christianity. Typical is H. C. Kee and F. W. Young, *Understanding the New Testament* (Prentice-Hall, 1958), chapters 1 and 2. Also F. F. Bruce, *The Spreading Flame* (Paternoster, 1958), p. 70, where he says: "Christianity began as one among several parties in first-century Palestinian Judaism, or so at least it appeared . . . The party of the Nazarenes took its place among the others.

12 So strong is the evidence from the Qumran scrolls that Christianity developed within Judaism that Edmund Wilson, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea* (Oxford, 1955), p. 108, argues that "the rise of Christianity should, at last, be generally understood as simply an episode of human history rather than propagated as dogma and divine revelation." But this is too strong. As Krister Stendahl shows in his *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (Harper, 1957), p. 4f. the Christian movement could adopt certain ideas and practices from earlier sources without being dependent on them. Christianity can be a revealed religion and yet through God's providence find its nurture in Judaism, which in turn is a revealed religion. Cf. R. T. Flewelling, "Battle of the Scrolls" *(The Personalist* 39, p. 8) who says: "The Scrolls now give us the opportunity to compare the Messianic ideas of a Jewish sect called Christians with another Jewish sect already on the scene."

13 "The believers in Antioch were given a nickname, which, it seems, was not liked. They were called *Christians,* a Latin formation meaning soldiers or dependants of the Christus. The word Christus or Messiah could not help suggesting the idea of a claimant to the throne of David, and it may be that these political associations of the word give us the clue to its use. It suggests that the faith had come to the attention of the Roman authorities, and this, in its turn, suggests that the course of evangelization was not running smoothly. The word Christian seems to crop up at first in connection with legal trials and persecutions." Philip Carrington, *The Early Christian Church,* Vol. I, p. 67.

R. C. H. Lenski, *The Acts of the Apostles,* p. 458, points out that in all three instances where "Christian" appears it is a name that was given to the disciples by others. "The Greeks invented this name," he says, and he contends that the Jews would never have associated the name Messiah with the disciples. Lenski also observes that the Codex Sinaiticus has a variant in Acts 11:26, giving "Chrestians" as the correct rendering, which means "fools" or some such term of reproach. But this is unlikely, for the term Christian was first used as a means of distinguishing the disciples from other Jews. Lenski argues that the verb "called" or "to bear a name" implies that it was bestowed by outsiders.

14 W. E. Garrison and A. T. DeGroot, *The Disciples of Christ: A History* (Christian Board of Publication, 1948) p. 209f. give with some detail the facts of the dispute between Stone and Campbell over the name. Stone believed "Christian" to be a God ordained name, while Campbell thought "Disciple" was more distinctive.

Campbell issued a hymnal in collaboration with Stone, and he called it *The Disciples' Hymn Book* without consulting Stone. But when Stone protested, he changed it to *The Christian Hymn Book.*

15 K. S. Latourette, *A History of Christianity* (Harper, 1953) p. 68: "It was at Antioch, fittingly, that the followers of Jesus were first given the distinctive designation by which they have ever since been known, Christian. The word, itself Greek, symbolized the emergence of the new faith into the wider world."

16 The term *church* or *kirk* is derived from the Greek "kurious oikos" (house of the Lord), and came down to us through the Anglo-Saxon (circe) and old German (kirche). While *kuriakos* (a contraction of "kurious oikos" and meaning *belonging to the Lord*) is used in the NT of "the supper that belongs to the Lord" (l Cor. 11:20) and of "the day that belongs to the Lord" (Rev. 1:10), it is never used in connection with the *ekklesia.* This means that "church" is not correct translation of *ekklesia.* For this reason "church" never appears in some improved translations. Campbell in his *Living Oracles* uses "congregation" and Schonfield in his *Authentic New Testament* uses "community." Since Schonfield is a Jew, this illustrates how a Jewish *ekklesia* might choose to employ "assembly" or "synagogue." It is inconceivable to me that they would ever use the distorted term *church,* and I feel sure that the restored congregation should not.

17 It is probable that there was no such thing as a "church building" before 175 A. D. As to the reason for this delay different answers have been given: persecution, poverty, belief that the Lord would soon come, too busy preaching, or simply did not need them since they had synagogues and private homes to meet in. They also *legally* met in the lodge-rooms of the Roman *sodalicia*, a society similar to our secret fraternities. Actually the *sodalicia* was a burial society that feasted and fasted in honor of its dead. J. B. S. Holborn thinks that the private home was the most influential in the earliest Christian architecture, that when buildings were erected they were designed after the private home. He suggests that the first property owned by a church was likely a remodeled private home. Archaeologists have discovered a few Christian chapels in ancient catacombs that were apparently built or at least remodeled by the saints, but these are no earlier than 250 A. D. and would not represent the usual practice. Buildings seem to have come with the rise of the clergy. (cf. *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* under "Architecture")

18 *Millennial Harbinger* 5, p. 7.

19 *Millennial Harbinger* 3, p. 229.

20 Emil Schurer, *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* 2, p. 75, points out that the synagogue was seated in an appointed order with the most distinguished members at the front and the younger ones behind. He thinks it probable that men and women were separated. Lepers also had separate seats. Philo tells how quietly the people sat in rapt attention listening to an elder as he stands in their midst expounding the law. Philo thought of the Hellenistic synagogues primarily as schools. (see G. F. Moore, *Judaism* I, p. 306)

21 C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development* (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1956) p. 7: "The New Testament writers draw a clear distinction between preaching and teaching . . . Much of our preaching in Church at the present day would not have been recognized by the early Christians as *kerugma* . . . For the early Church, then, to preach the Gospel was by no means the same thing as to deliver moral instruction or exhortation . . . Preaching is the public proclamation of Christianity to the non. Christian world."

22 Jude 12; 2 Pet. 2:13. Hans Leitzmann, *Founding of the Church Universal* (Scribners, 1952) p. 125, says: "The agape (feast of love) lived for centuries apart from the formal liturgy and worship of the church." Tertullian, about 200 A. D., referred to "our humble feasts" in his *Apology* (chap. 39) and argued that it was worth whatever it cost because of its benefit to the needy.

23 In the primitive church lakes and streams were used for the immersions that were usually in private. In the catacombs underground streams were sometime used. It was not until the fourth century that baptisteries were built, and they were then separate buildings apart from the meetinghouse. It was not until immersion was replaced by sprinkling and pouring that the rite was brought into the sanctuary itself, and it then became a font instead of a baptistry. The practice of building a baptistry above the pulpit in public view is of very recent origin.

24 Campbell taught the young churches of the Restoration to keep a chronicle of their work. He listed in detail what should go into that history.

25 In Rom. 16:1 Phoebe is called a deaconess. It is the same word from which we get *minister.*

26 T. W. Manson, *Ministry and Priesthood* (London: Epworth Press, 1958) p. 21: "The Christianity that conquered the Roman Empire was not an affair of brilliant preachers addressing packed congregation. We have, so far as I know, nothing much in the way of brilliant preachers in the first three hundred years of the Church's life . . . When we try to picture how it was done we seem to see domestic servants teaching Christ in and through their domestic service, workers doing it through their work, small shopkeepers through their trade, and so on, rather than eloquent propagandists swaying mass meetings of interested inquiries."

27 While elders may have been supported in the early church, it was certainly meager and in no wise comparable to the salary system of modern religion. Edwin Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches,* p. 150, points out that when church officers were paid it was based upon freewill offerings and only on the grounds of their poverty. When the Montanists put their clergy on a salary it was considered an heretical innovation by the church universal. I am not sure that 1 Tim. 5:17 implies financial support for elders, but I am inclined to think it does

28 In the light of what is just and equal it is not right that man should be taxed for the maintenance of a religious institution that he does not believe in. To tax him for the support of public education is just, whether he believes in it or not, for this is for the good of all. But a religious institution is partisan and sectarian.

29 Harold A. Bosley, *What Did the Word Council Say to You?* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1945)

30 W. E. Garrison, *The Quest and Character of a United Church* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1957). Especially the chapter on "The Denomination System."

31 There have been a few studies dealing with the primitive church as the pattern for modern religion. See J. Fenton Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia;* W. D. Davies, *A Normative Pattern of Church Life in the New Testament: Fact or Fancy?*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂



A NOVEL ON CAMPBELL'S LIFE

In our book review for this issue of the quarterly Carl Ketcherside and I inadvertently reviewed the same book. Due to the importance of this novel on Campbell's life, I thought it well to go on and publish *both* reviews so that the readers might have the verdict of two men. Carl tells me be stayed up half the night reading this book (he told his wife he would not dare go to bed and leave any brother of his in a cold jail in Scotland), so it is nothing but right that our readers should have opportunity to share his enthusiasm—and to see if he got his brother out of jail!—the Editor

The Fool of God by Louis Cochran. Duell, Sloan and Pearce, New York, 1958. $4.95.

In another seven years we will come to the century mark since the death of Alexander Campbell, and we have gone all these years without an historical novel of one of the noblest and most remarkable leaders of early America. Professor Perry Miller of Harvard once told me that he thought historians had neglected Campbell, and that he believed that Campbell should be given credit as a great frontiersman who helped to shape the pattern of early American life. The Harvard historian observed that while the Disciples had adequately emphasized Campbell's religious significance, he is nevertheless neglected by the scholars in general as a cultural and educational leader in America's frontier life.

This vacuum is partly filled by this absorbing historical novel by Mr. Cochran, who is respected in literary circles for such works as *Boss Man*, *Black Earth* and *Hallelujah Mississippi*. It is gratifying that a novel on Campbell's life is authored by a significant novelist and biographer and that it is published by a non-sectarian publishing house.

Mr. Cochran has done a pain-staking job in this biographical study. He gathered materials for fifteen years and spent three years in writing. He visited every principal locality frequented by Campbell, who was an incessant and enthusiastic traveler. He did research in many libraries, court houses, newspaper files, and historical societies both in this country and abroad. He talked personally with the three living grandchildren of Alexander Campbell, one of whom has since died. He worked with Boyd B. Stutler, who was the first to establish a link between John Brown the abolitionist and Alexander Campbell the reformer. He spent a summer at Bethany going through the Campbelliana at the college and exploring the countryside that gave birth to the Restoration Movement.

Since Cochran is so adept at characterization he makes some of the lesser known associates take on, new importance. There is Charlie Poole, a slave that Campbell set free and put on a pension long before the Civil War, who thirty years later attended Campbell's funeral. It is a gripping scene with the former slave standing at the graveside of the man who freed him and supported him because of the love of God, while most other slaves had been liberated only after the cruel Civil War, which had recently ended.

Then there is William Pendleton who was twice Campbell's son-in-law, whom Cochran makes a sounding-board for Campbell's audible thinking. When the organization of a national convention was in question, Cochran has Campbell say to Pendleton: "Just because there is no New Testament authority for such an organization does not mean we are acting in an unscriptural manner. I am beginning to realize, William, that to ask for a positive precept for everything in the details of the church is as irrational as to ask for a uniform standard of apparel for all persons in the church."

The two wives of Campbell will both endear themselves to the reader. Margaret is the beautiful daughter of a well-to-do Virginia farmer, who first saw Alexander as he walked out the pathway to her door to deliver some books to her father. Cochran draws upon historical fact when he has her say, "Lord, that's my man! Cochran characterizes her as pretty and playful. She serves as a balance wheel to the impetuous and proud Alexander, who has considerable trouble with his own sense of power when a young man. It was Margaret who persuaded Alexander that he should accept her father's offer of moving in with the Brown family and working on the farm. Alexander lad resolved that he would never accept money for preaching, and that he wanted to pursue the life of both a preacher and a family man. What was he to do? He could see that Mr. Brown's offer was the answer to his problem once he brought his pride under control. Eventually Mr. Brown, who had but the one child, gave the farm to Alexander and Margaret and moved to nearby Wellsburg to open a store. Alexander proved to be an enterprising farmer and was soon the largest wool producer in Virginia and one of the largest land owners. Some of the ministers resented Campbell's chiding them as "stall fed clergy" when he himself was one of the richest men in Virginia.

Margaret's wit and wisdom helped to check the pride of her influential husband. When he proudly told her that his views had penetrated into the Western Reserve, she remonstrated: "Your views or God's truth?" But Margaret was sickly and was destined to go to an early grave, She bore Campbell eight children, all of whom died before Campbell himself passed on. Tuberculosis was one of America's worst enemies in that day and it certainly decimated the Campbell family. The reader is gratified that Margaret was able to make a thrilling trip to the South with her husband before she died, which included three weeks in Nashville. Campbell was forty years old and a famous man when Margaret died. She herself once suggested to Alexander that if he ever needed another wife he could do

no better than to select her dear friend, Selina Bakewell, who had often been in the Campbell home and whom Campbell himself immersed into Christ.

Selina was so different from Margaret and yet an equal blessing. Margaret was witty and playful while Selina was serious and straight-laced. She lived in the shadow of an avenging God and conducted her home with the austerity of a pioneering Puritan. When they were once in New York, Alexander suggested that they hear Jenny Lind, the nightingale of Sweden, who was captivating America at that time. But this was too worldly for Selina, who chose to go to the Fair instead. On another occasion she supposed it would not be a sin to visit the White House, so she and Alexander enjoyed a thirty minute conversation with President Buchanan, who had heard Campbell preach the day before. Selina's temperament was such a contrast to Margaret's that ole faithful Holly, the Negro cook who had served as midwife to Margaret, confided to Alexander that she was not happy with Selina and wanted to move to Wellsburg and work for the Brown family. Holly was a wedding present to Margaret from her father. Campbell freed her and put her on a pension. These precious moments in the life of Campbell make Cochran's book an absorbing one.

Selina, who was not so charming as Margaret (Cochran says she was "almost pretty" in the moonlight!), mellows with the years and her aloofness gradually transforms into one of the warmest personalities of the book. She is not only a loving mother to Margaret's sickly children, but she bears six of her own, naming one of them Margaret in honor of her husband's first wife and her own dear friend. She encourages Campbell to take his long, arduous journeys that kept him away from home months at a time. She gave birth to children and buried others while Alexander was far away preaching the gospel. The reader is almost moved to tears when Alexander presents her with the first copy of his volume of addresses, which he dedicated to her for her loyalty. Her misty eyes reveal that she is visibly moved by the surprise and says, "I've tried to be a good wife. I love you, Mr. Campbell. I've loved you since the first time I heard you preach in Wellsburg. My goodness me, that's been forty years ago!" And then she added as she ran her fingers over the printed lines of the dedication: "And all these years I've felt I was living in Margaret's shadow!"

The characterization of Thomas Campbell, his father, is also excellent. When Alexander received word from "Racoon" John Smith that the Disciples and Stonites were uniting, he sent a servant after father Thomas. He and Alexander discussed the significance of the new development for hours. Thomas would team up with Margaret in an effort to check the impulsiveness of the militant, youthful Alexander.

Cochran *knows* Alexander Campbell. He vividly portrays him as a man of sorrows, grieved as much over the strife that led to the Civil War as the deaths in his family. He was acquainted with grief and knew well the pale rider of death that so often visited his home.

Perhaps the greatest shock of his life was the drowning of his twelve year old son, Wycliffe, the most promising of his children, a lad who had memorized the entire book of Proverbs and who had imbibed the spirituality of his father. This tragedy was even more penetrating since it took place while Campbell was in Europe, where incidentally he had many trying experiences, including ten days in jail and a siege of illness that followed. Campbell was a persecuted man. Three times his enemies charged him with libel, but he felt in each case the real reason was animosity aroused by his opposition to sectarianism. Ostensibly he was jailed in Scotland because of a libel charge growing out of his views on slavery, but Cochran shows that it was an unholy effort to discredit Campbell's plea for Restoration. He became almost immune to the cruel sting of death. After one of his many trips to "God's Acre," the family cemetery, he replied to a question about death by turning and looking back at the many graves of his own children and saying, "Death? There is no such thing as death."

Our author does his best work in revealing the complex character of Campbell He was a willful man, filled with conviction, and consumed by a great cause. He was austere, sometimes even caustic, and yet as meek as a Iamb and a lonely solitary figure. He was a man of many contradictions. Though he passed through the many changes in conviction that goes with intellectual maturity, he sought to be consistent with the Alexander Campbell of yesteryear. Cochran calls him "a strange complex man," one that his closest friends never really understood.

The book is exciting also because of its setting. The reader comes to feel the atmosphere of the Virginia hills that cradled the Restoration Movement. He is introduced to Campbell the editor and preacher, and Campbell the college president, Campbell the postmaster, and Campbell the statesman. He sees towns rise and receive their names, Campbell himself naming Bethany. He sees the early American stagecoach and later the steamers, not to mention the 300 mile journeys that Campbell made on horseback. Campbell is a great traveler for his times, perhaps as itinerant as any man of his day. The times bristle with interesting people. Campbell encounters John Randolph, James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, and John Marshall in the state constitutional convention; meets Jefferson Davis, Daniel Webster, and Stephen Douglas in the halls of congress; entertains Henry Clay in his home and collaborates with him in the cause of abolition in Kentucky. Campbell educated the nephews of Jeff Davis, one of them being accidentally killed while at Bethany. Campbell talks about Lincoln, pointing out that his father was in the Restoration Movement.

Above all Campbell was a reformer. Cochran takes us behind the scenes of the Purcell, Owen, and Rice debates. The novelist concludes that Campbell was displeased with the Rice encounter due to its sectarian spirit, and he feels this experience modulated Campbell's belligerency, and that he was henceforth more tolerant toward sectarian

differences. It was upon his return from the Rice debate that he wrote his answer to the now famous Lunenburg letter. This may be the most significant conclusion Cochran reaches in regards to an interpretation of the man.

The readers of this book will look for more on Campbell from the pen of Mr. Cochran, for his fifteen years of research into Campbelliana has no doubt made him the best informed person on the life of Alexander Campbell.

—Leroy Garrett

KETCHERSIDE'S REVIEW OF THE FOOL OF GOD

This book, a novel based on the life of Alexander Campbell, is the eighth volume by Louis Cochran, and was produced after fifteen years of extensive research. It is a thrilling story, filled with authentic background material, and is a valuable contribution to the study of pioneer Americans. The author says, in his preliminary note: "In its essentials this is a factual book. Every event actually occurred, or had its basis in solid fact; each person lived, and played his role much as is related here. The story does not presume to be a study of Campbell's religious thinking, or an account of the movement to re-establish Christian unity by the elimination of human creeds and the restoration of New Testament Christianity. It is rather, the portrait of a man whose heart embraced all Christians as brothers; whose mind was open to all truth; whose eyes had seen the vision of the coming of one church."

The average reader will be amazed at the close acquaintance of Campbell with historic figures. He knew intimately Henry Clay, President Buchanan, ex-presidents James Madison and James Monroe, Chief Justice Marshall, et. al., and was respected by them. The family of Jefferson Davis came under the influence of the restoration movement. Thomas Lincoln, father of Abraham Lincoln, was a member of the congregation at Charleston, Illinois. Of special interest is the connection with John Brown, radical Abolitionist, who seized Harper's Ferry, and was later hanged.

The family life at Bethany is described in fascinating detail, with sunshine and shadow faithfully depicted. The loss of his first wife, and all the children she bore him, by the dread killer, consumption; and the drowning of his son, Wycliffe, while the father was on a foreign preaching tour, these make the tears start as you envision the trust and faith which made it possible for Campbell to keep going despite the chastening hand of sorrow. The author portrays him as a man of ambition, tempted by pride and aspiration to leadership, against which he was forced to fight with all his will. A master of sarcasm and ridicule, some of his earlier writings created a furore, much to the dislike of his father, who was of gender temperament.

There were great moments in the life of Campbell, and the author handles these crises with befitting candor. The sensation caused by his sermon on the law, the sense of frustration while he was a member of the Virginia Constitutional Convention, and the account of each of his major debates, will be of more than passing interest. The reader will learn much about the conditions which led to starting the periodicals, *The Christian Baptist*, and *Millennial Harbinger*, and the establishment of Bethany College and the Christian Missionary Society.

This reviewer believes the book has come at an opportune time in God's program for our generation. The term "restoration" is heard more frequently now than at any time for the last seventy-five years, and once more the theme of "the unity of all believers" challenges the thinking of dedicated men who are convinced that sectarianism thwarts the divine plan and the party spirit is a work of the flesh. The factions and fragments of the disciple brotherhood need to recapture the dream which drove the pioneers with such inner compulsion. We need to sense again that we are tools of God and instruments of destiny.

It will become apparent how far *The System*, which today equates itself with the New Testament church, has drifted from its moorings. Its unwritten creeds, humanly devised tests of fellowship, intolerant legalistic attitude, and exaltation of opinions, have fractured and shattered its constituency into so many hostile parties, that the plea for "unity of believers" has degenerated into a weak attempt of each splinter parry to proselyte from the others, no one else being regarded as a child of God. It will do these partisans good to read the following words of Alexander Campbell, as quoted in the Book:

"I was once so straight that, like the Indian's tree, I leaned the other way. I was once so strict a Separatist that I would neither pray nor sing praises with anyone who was not as perfect as I supposed myself to be. In this most unpopular course I persisted until I discovered the mistake and saw that on the principle embraced in my conduct there never could be a congregation or church upon earth. This plan of making our own nest and fluttering over our own brood; of building our own tent and of confining all goodness and grace to our noble selves and the elect few who are like us, is the quintessence of sublimated pharisaism." —W. Carl Ketcherside

HISTORY AND THE BIBLE

The Bible As History, Werner Keller, W. Morrow Pub. Co., New York, 1956, $5.95.

This is a profound and scholarly work which should be read closely. It would appear that the author has done a masterful job of corroborating the Bible with history. Biblical accounts that many of us would interpret as miraculous and supernatural, such as the Story of Moses and the burning bush, the crossing of the Red Sea, the manna that fell from heaven, are explained by Mr. Keller as natural occurrences. The burning bush was no more

than a mistletoe in full bloom, while the manna was merely a resinous exudation from the tamarisk trees caused by plant lice. The crossing of the Red Sea is explained as being the "Reed Sea," a shallow body of water that is easily forded. But Mr. Keller did not explain how Pharaoh's forces were swallowed up in this shallow stream!

Moses produces water out of a porous limestone rock as anyone could have done, not by any miraculous power. The author seems consistently eager for "natural" explanations, which are harder to accept than the miracles themselves. While this will disappoint many of our readers who believe in the supernatural origin of the Bible, it is nonetheless true that Mr. Keller has given us a book that will greatly enhance our appreciation for the Bible as a book of history.

He shows us, for instance, how Hezekiah's conduit was discovered after nearly 3,000 years, thus confirming the Biblical account. He also tells the Story of the finding of copper mines, which substantiates the Biblical account of Palestine: "The Lord thy God bringeth thee into a land whose stones are iron and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass" (Dt. 8:7,9). The diggers have turned up blast furnaces used by King Solomon.

In other chapters Mr. Keller tells about ancient Egypt, Assyria, and Babylon, explaining the biblical references to the history of these mighty empires. References to the bondage of the children of Israel have been found among the inscriptions of old Egypt. In the ruins of the old Assyrian empire a mass grave of some 2,000 soldiers has been found, which are believed to be from the army of Sennacherib mentioned in Isaiah 37. Babylon has been resurrected and Nebuchadnezzar has been confirmed as one of the greatest builders of history, which agrees with Daniel 4:30. —Eliot Williams

Rabbinic Stories for Christian Ministers and Teachers, William B. Silverman. Abingdon Press, New York, 1958. $3.50.

This volume, written by an outstanding rabbi, contains stories, homilies, legends, and interpretations from rabbinic literature—the type of material that Jesus studied in his early life. In the Introduction Halford Luccock says, "Rabbi Silverman brings forth fascinating stories from some of the world's richest collections. Indeed there is nothing in world literature to compare with them. And as they say solemnly over TV, 'It is a *live* presentation.' Very live! And 'in living color'—the color of life."

One will find such rabbinic wisdom as, "Everyone must have two pockets, so that he can reach into the one or the other according to his need. In his right pocket are the words, "For my sake the world was created," and in the other, "I am earth and ashes."—Leroy Garrett

The Spreading Flame, F. F. Bruce. London: Paternoster Press, 1958, $3.00.

If you are interested in a one-volume church history that is excellently done, I would suggest this one. Not only is Bruce a scholar of first rank, but this particular work treats the rise and progress of Christianity to the conversion of the English in 597 AD. Splendid use is made of primary sources and the story of the early church is vividly told.

The publishers say of this work: "Professor Bruce here presents some thing much more than mere history; he follows the course of the Spirit of Christ kindling in men's souls an in extinguishable blaze that spread over the face of the earth. It is the story of the shame and glory of the lowly Nazarenes, repudiated alike by an arrogant Pharaisaism and a hostile Gentile world; the story of the Kingdom of God advancing on an earthly city that itself claimed to be eternal, and eventually mounting the very throne of the Caesars. So across Europe to Britain, where the Scots, the Irish, and finally the English, took up the torch which they were eventually to carry to the uttermost parts of the earth."—Leroy Garrett

TOOLS OF THOUGHT

A New Testament Wordbook and *More New Testament Words*, William Barclay, Harper & Brothers, New York, $2.50 each.

The desire to learn is the most important attribute a student can have. Pertinent and profitable material from which to learn is next in importance. Pertinent and profitable material in that it treats of the subject you are interested in and is profitable to you and those who hear you. The difference between people very often is, that those who stand out have communed with the great. I have heard the editor of *Mission Messenger* say that all men know is between bookends. What does all this mean to you and me? It means this, that you and I too can commune with the great—through books. It means that a good library is invaluable to students of all ages as a source of material from which to broaden our knowledge.

Barclay's *New Testament Word Books* would be worthy additions to your library. They are deserving of the things we have intimated above. He treats of Greek words, but no knowledge of Greek is necessary. He brings forth untranslatable riches of great NT words by taking us into the mind of the people of NT times. We live with them, and become one of them. Involuntarily we give to these words the sense which they had in the age when the NT was being written. Their ideas be come our ideas; we understand the words agreeable to the degree of knowledge possessed in that age. The religions professed by them, and the sacred and civil rights or customs, become tools to enable us to probe deeper into those "sound words". The associations these words had with persons, events, ideas, and with other words, give them a certain flavor which cannot be rendered in translation. These associations effect their meaning and significance in a most important way. Words

you will especially thrill at are, fellowship, church, sin, covenant, patience, mercy, and so many others.

You will be pleased with the simple arrangement too. All words are transliterated and alphabetized. The verses and different ways the word is used in the NT are cited. He discusses etymology and points out how different translators have rendered the word in English. Literary and historical writings are used to show how the word was used prior to and during NT times. Its everyday usages as discovered in business letters and inscriptions are shown. After displaying each facet of the word, it is again placed in its NT setting where it reveals a new dimension of meaning. A reading with or without a knowledge of Greek, will find his understanding deepened.—Clint Evans

(All books reviewed in this column may be ordered from Restoration Press, 1916 Western Dr., Alton, Illinois.)

WORDS OF THE WISE

"The only freedom which deserves the name is that of pursuing our Own good in our own way, so long as we do not attempt to deprive others of theirs or impede their efforts to obtain it. In proportion to the development of his individuality, each person becomes more valuable to himself, and is therefore capable of being more valuable to others. There is a greater fulness of life about his own existence, and when there is more life in the units there is more in the mass which is composed of them." (John Stewart Mill, *Essay on Freedom*)

*

"Freedom has a thousand charms to show,
That slaves, howe'er contented, never know." (Cowper)

*

"The sad passion for heresy-hunting, which obtained among Christians as early as the second century, was not only a result of fanatical devotion to true doctrine, but quite as much an outcome of their rigid organization and of the exalted predicates of honour which they applied to themselves as the church of God." (Adolf Harnack, *Expansion* 2, p. 62)

*

Queen Elizabeth I stated that when she was a child she knew six languages better than English. She read the New Testament in Greek and once made her own translation of Paul's epistles. She states, "I walk many times in the pleasant fields of Holy Scripture. . . and lay them up at length in the high seat of memory."

⁂ ⁂ ⁂



ALEXANDER CAMPBELL AND MARK TWAIN

(This extract from *Mark Twain's Autobiography* will interest our readers due to its reference to Campbell, an incident in his life that may not be generally known by Campbellian scholars.)

Once the celebrated founder of the at that time new and widespread sect called Campbellites arrived in our village from Kentucky, and it made a prodigious excitement. The farmers and their families drove or tramped into the village from miles around to get a sight of the illustrious Alexander Campbell and to have a chance to hear him preach. When he preached in a church many had to be disappointed, for there was no church that would begin to hold all the applicants; so in order to accommodate all, he preached in the open air in the public square, and that was the first time in my life that I had realized what a mighty population this planet contains when you get them all together.

He preached a sermon on one of these occasions which he had written especially for that occasion. All the Campbellites wanted it printed, so that they could save it and read it over and over again, and get it by heart. So they drummed up sixteen dollars, which was a large sum then, and for this great sum Mr. Ament contracted to print five hundred copies of that sermon and put them in yellow paper covers. It was a sixteen-page duodecimo pamphlet, and it was a great event in our office. As we regarded it, it was a book, and it promoted us to the dignity of book printers. Moreover, no such mass of actual money as sixteen dollars, in one bunch, had ever entered that office on any previous occasion. People didn't pay for their paper and for their advertising in money; they paid in dry-goods, sugar, coffee, hickory wood, oak wood, turnips, pumpkins, onions, watermelons—and it was very seldom indeed that a man paid in money, and when that happened we thought there was something the matter with him.

We set up the great book in pages—eight pages to a form—and by help of a printer's manual we managed to get the pages in their apparently crazy but really sane places on the imposing-stone. We printed that form on a Thursday. Then we set up the remaining eight

pages, locked them into a form, and struck a proof. Wales read the proof, and presently was aghast, for he had struck a snag. And it was a bad time to strike a snag, because it was Saturday; it was approaching noon; Saturday afternoon was our holiday, and we wanted to get away and go fishing. At such a time as this Wales struck that snag and showed us what has happened. He had left out a couple of words in a thin-spaced page of solid matter and there wasn't another break-line for two or three pages ahead. What in the world was to be done? Overrun all those pages in order to get in the two missing words? Apparently there was no other way. It would take an hour to do it. Then a revise must be sent to the great minister; we must wait for him to read the revise; if he encountered any errors we must correct them. It looked as if we might lose half the afternoon before we could get away. Then Wales had one of his brilliant ideas. In the line in which the "out" had been made occurred the name Jesus Christ. Wales reduced it in the French way to J. C. It made room for the missing words, but it took 99 percent of the solemnity out of a particularly solemn sentence. We sent off the revise and waited. We were not intending to wait long. In the circumstances we meant to get back, but we were not speedy enough. Presently the great Alexander Campbell appeared at the far end of that sixty-foot room, and his countenance cast a gloom over the whole place. He strode down to our end and what he said was brief, but it was very stern, and it was to the point. He read Wales a lecture. He said, "So long as you live, don't you ever diminish the Saviour's name again. Put it *all* in." He repeated this admonition a couple of times to emphasize it, then he went away.

In that day the common swearers of the region had a way of their own of *emphasizing* the Saviour's name when they were using it profanely, and this fact intruded itself into Wales's incorrigible mind. It offered him an opportunity for a momentary entertainment which seemed to him to be more precious and more valuable than even fishing and swimming could afford. So he imposed upon himself the long and weary and dreary task of over-running all those three pages in order to improve upon his former work and incidentally and thoughtfully improve upon the great preacher's admonition. He enlarged the offending J. C. into Jesus H. Christ. Wales knew that that would make prodigious trouble, and it did. But it was not in him to resist it. He had to succumb to the law of his make. I don't remember what his punishment was, but he was not the person to care for that. He had already collected his dividend.

PLUS AND MINUS SIGNS

I have finished reading the first copy of *Restoration Review.* In my judgment you would be doing the cause of Christ a distinctive service by issuing no further copies of it. It seems to me you are gradually departing from the faith. Yes, there are many things that should be corrected in the church, but to try to make out that the church is just another denomination among sister denominations is a far cry from the truth. Such a course cannot do good. This is not the course Paul pursued in his first letter

to Corinth. If you persist in the course you have taken I am fearfully afraid your soul will be lost. May God help you to see the error of your way. "Higher education" certainly has not helped you. Love prompts me to raise this voice of warning.—Fred E. Dennis, Marietta, Ohio.

Thank you for your communication of March 28th. 1 am glad you felt free to express yourself so pointedly. I intend for my work to be reasonably constructive and for the enhancement of mankind, but it may well be that it is not. You may be exactly right in asserting that no more issues should be forthcoming. In such a case I can only do what appears to me to be the wisest course and for the good of the greatest number, and in view of this there will be more issues of the journal published. It would no doubt be wrong for you to publish or edit such a journal; but for me it may be the very thing that God wants done.

That you would raise this voice of warning with love is even more significant. I can love the man who warns me because he loves me. This binds us together in perfect harmony, and that is what Paul said love would do.

I have not made myself clear if you understand me to teach that the church is "just another denomination among sister denominations," and I heartily agree that such a view is "a far cry from the truth." The church is the body of Christ, made up of all those who are *in Christ.* While it may be true that the saints are scattered through a denominational world, the body of Christ is not sectarian. 1 do not equate the New Testament *ekklesia* with what many of my brethren call "the Church of Christ." The church of God has existed on this earth since it was founded by our Lord, which means it was here long before there was a Restoration Movement or the modern religious body called the "Church of Christ." While I believe that the Campbell movement, which has resulted in three more denominations, is an effort to restore the New Testament church, I do not believe that the movement is the church itself. This was, of course, the view of Alexander Campbell.

I must admit that I do not know what you mean by "higher education." Whatever it means, I doubt if my position on the church can be attributed thereto, for my position is the same as that held by nearly all of our pioneers, who, I presume, were not exposed to "higher education."

If you would like to write an exposure of my views, I would be glad to consider it for publication. You may have truth that I have not yet found, so I shall be willing to read what you write and to pass it along to my readers.

You express concern for my soul and this I greatly appreciate. But is a soul in danger because it is wrong? If so, who is not in danger? Is it not the condition of a man's heart, his devotion to what he believes to be the truth, that determines his destiny? If a man is saved or lost by what he knows or doesn't know, all of us are in serious trouble. It is the love a man has for God that makes the difference (1 Cor. 8:2) .

REACTIONS TO FIRST ISSUE

"I want to thank you for sending me notice of the *Restoration Review* . . .." (Barry Richards, Beaver, Pa.)

"Praise God, and may He overflow your cup with blessings . . . *Bible Talk* did wonderful things for me. It means a great deal to have the writings of one with whom I can so wholeheartedly agree most of the time, and with whom I can honestly and frankly disagree without fear of bitterness. .. ." (Donald Hayes, Los Angeles, Calif.)

"It promises to be an excellent publication . . . Thank you for your noble efforts in bringing moral enlightenment to our decadent and immoral culture . . .." (Lawson Wallace, Nocona, Texas)

"In my judgment you would be doing the cause of Christ a distinctive service by issuing no further copies . . ." (Fred E. Dennis, Marietta, Ohio)

"It is a *wonderful* work. The articles are so complete and so good . . .." (Mrs. Arthur Nighswonger, Independence, Mo.)

"How do you find the *time* or the energy for such ambitious undertakings? But it must give you great satisfaction to look at the finished product, both outside and in, and think what you have done." (Dr. Ruth Rose, MacMurray College)

"It is excellent in format, it is down to earth, yet it is sufficiently scholarly that you will not need to be ashamed to hand it to anyone . . ." (W. Carl Ketcherside, St. Louis, Mo.)

"I am greatly interested in your journal which I have read with consummate interest. I have long cherished the hope that we might utilize this strong Campbell heritage to forward a closer relationship between the elements of the Restoration Movement. I believe this can be done at the intellectual level more easily than any other . . ." (President Perry Epler Gresham, Bethany College)

"During most of the morning I have been reading—I should say absorbing—your article "Toward Emotional Maturity." This article has helped me more than a dozen sermons *possibly* could. *Only* yesterday a good friend asked me, "What is the use of life anyway? If we must always have wars, why struggle?" Your article is absolutely the best answer to this question that I have ever read. The school which I attend made a survey by secret ballot to determine the attitude of the student body about cheating. Yesterday, during the meeting of the Senior Honor Society, the results of this survey were given. One out of every two students admitted that he cheats. The worst part of it is that they did not believe it to be wrong . . . What is wrong with a society in which half of the students not only cheat, but believe in cheating? . . . (Myra Hill, high school student, Madison, Tenn.)

"May I be one of the many who must say to you and Clint Evans, well done! The material is superb. Surely a void in American letters is being filled." (I. M. Roberts, Dallas, Texas)

"Well, now, Leroy, I'm just going to talk to you for awhile. 'Much learning . . ..' I used to pity the poor horse you were riding, as he galloped by, tongue hanging out and eyes glassy with fatigue. And now the old fellow stands looking over the fence, half asleep, pricking up his ears only when he sees another horse somewhere in the distance. 'Much learning . . .'! I am saddened to see you swerving so far to the left, Leroy, even to the extent of giving up everything you must have stood for, except anything outside of the teaching and practice of 'any of the disciple churches.' You have even gone so far as to use unscriptural terms, such as 'disciple church.' And then you admit to wondering if 'our pioneers' were wise in breaking away from the established churches of their day. I see you have shelved the Bible and put Plato, Aristotle, and Socrates in its place. . ." (Harry Pratt, Franklin, Minn.)

"I do not always agree with your ideas, but you always give me something to think about. . ." (Ollie Saffer, Winchester, Ill.)

"When you sent the first copy of *Bible Talk* I immediately received eleven subs to *Restoration Review* after passing it around to a few families of the West Suburban Church of Christ. I am sure you never thought that one booklet would go into so many homes as that one has—and it is now in Texas! . . . God will reward you for the great work you are doing . . ." (Polly Long, Franklin Park, Ill.)

"I continue to marvel at your prodigious capacity for work. The article on 'Toward Emotional Maturity' shows psychological insight." (Dr. James Crumbaugh, Dept. of Psychology, MacMurray College)

"I would dare tell no one that I *seriously* read what you write, for I would lose all the little influence I have. One preacher told me he was subscribing so he would know what's going on and could counteract what you teach. Brother Garrett, you are correct in one thing at least—most of us think we have *already arrived* and have become Pharisaical toward those who haven't yet reached our level . . . If my name ever appeared in your paper, I would be anathema in the eyes of many . . . There will probably come a day when I'll make a break, but I'll have to do more studying first. Would you accept anonymous articles? . . . (Name withheld for obvious reasons)

"It will provide its readers with rich, stimulating material, well worthy of serious consideration and study. Thank you for reserving space for a list of recommended books. This is a fine service you are rendering the subscribers." (Jerry Higginbotham, Maplewood, Mo.)

"You are quite right in your attitude towards Christian unity. If my novel on Alexander Campbell can generate a new approach we shall be more than happy about it all . . ." (Louis Cochran, author of *The Fool of God)*

FOR PROTECTION AGAINST THE HURTS OF LIFE

Rebecca Beard

It is the little hurts of life that go so deep, and it is from these the Master can free us by His love. The little irritations and the little hurts! Protect us from these by covering us with the mantle of Your love! Let it fall over us like a cone of light from our head to our feet. Cover us with the seamless garment—the full armor of the Lord. There is not a broken place in it through which you can be made vulnerable. Hold it close about you, and wear it always. Under its perfect protection, as long as you abide in love nothing can reach you, nothing can touch you, nothing can harm you, nothing can hurt you!

So long as you abide in love, never being critical, never irritated, never resentful, you can never be hurt again, for nothing can pass through this cloak of divine protection without being transformed into love. The beauty of the armor of God is that it transforms everything which touches it into love. If someone sends you harsh *criticism, if* one speaks false words about you, or deliberately tries to hurt you, these negative deeds are not even sent back to those who sent them, for there is no boomerang in love. Love knows no retaliation. Through the divine chemistry all arc lifted up, transmuted and transformed into love.

That is the mystery which man cannot comprehend, that love has this great power of translating every thing which is not love into itself. That is why we can love those who despitefully use us and persecute us. That is why we can love those who ignorantly and thoughtlessly hurt us. Everything hurtful that is sent to us but adds to the covering of love which protects us, and by and by there is something in love itself which will lift up those who would hurt us. For they do what they do our of a great longing and need for love. They are But turned inside out. They are But showing the rough side of the garment.

If we can receive all these things in perfect equanimity and forgiveness, without negative reaction, little by *little* they, too, will come under the spell of love and change through its power. For your forbearance and your patience, your understanding and compassion, are the tools which God uses to redeem His own.

How beautiful it is! How beautiful the feet upon the mountain of those who bring the tidings of great joy! How beautiful, Master, that You can teach us how to turn these pricks and arrows of outrageous fortune into the redeeming love that can lift those who crave love, and who suffer because they hurt needlessly. Thank you, Father. Thank you, Jesus.

"Vengeance is Mine,
I will repay,"
This the promise we have
been given.

Ours only to bless,
forgive, and pray
God's love may cleanse
that soul for heaven.
Each time we bless
Or voice a prayer
For one whose soul
still gropes for light
We loose some bond,
wipe out some debt
‘Til wholly cleansed
that soul sees God.

EMOTIONAL MATURITY

Mrs. R. A. Weingardt of Springfield, Illinois submits the following quotation as further study of what is involved in growing up.

“An acceptance of unpleasant facts, whatever their genesis, as concrete situations to be handled rather than hated. Maturity is ‘stick-to-itiveness,’ to struggle on until the job is finished. It is the quality that enables others to be able to depend on one—reliability. It is the endurance of difficulties, unpleasantness, discomfort, hardships.

“It means the ability to size things up, make one’s own decisions, determination. The mature person is patient. Maturity is respect and confidence in oneself. To a large extent the mature person accepts, works with and enjoys other people. He carries on his work, play, family and social life with confidence and enthusiasm and with a minimum of conflict, fear, and hostility.

“Marcus Aurelius was defining maturity when he said: ‘Man’s true greatness lies in the consciousness of an honest purpose in life, founded on a just estimate of himself and everything else, on frequent self-examinations, and a steady obedience to the rule which he knows to be right, without troubling himself about what others may think or say or whether they do or do not do, that which he thinks and says and does.’”

IF CAMPBELL LIVED TODAY

"If Alexander Campbell were alive today, I am sure he would recognize his fellow-Christians in every brotherhood or denomination, and in every country and in every race under the sun, and that he would still give his heart 'to him that loveth most.' He would be well-versed in all the modern scholarly research on the Scriptures, and would recognize, for example, that while there was fundamental unity in that ancient church we seek to emulate, there were also some fundamental differences; and that neither we nor any ocher group have yet found the pattern for the unity of the church. It is only by fellowship, worship, prayer, study and work, with other Christians, and by Christian love and forbearance, that Christian unity can be experienced.

"I think Alexander Campbell would take a long, long view of this whole ecumenical movement which is growing out of the lengthening shadow of his beloved Brush Run Church. Where is it leading us? To a United Church, we hope. But the way is not yet clear. I am sure Campbell would have difficulty in accepting the Lord's Supper only from the hands of a priest in the Apostolic succession; I think he would stumble over the reception of baptized infants. But hurdles are created to be hurdled. And eventually, in the Lord's good time, if our minds remain free in the tradition of Alexander Campbell's great legacy to us, and our hearts loving and true, we shall all yet enter into full membership in a church which is not 'our church' but in truth and in fact, as stated by Thomas Campbell in that immortal Declaration of Independence from spiritual bondage, the 'Declaration and Address,' will be the United Church of Christ upon earth, 'essentially, intentionally and constitutionally one.''' (Louis Cochran, "The Legacy of a Free Mind" in *College of the Bible Quarterly* 36, p. 43)

EXCHANGE WITH EDITOR

The following exchange between J. W. Roberts of Abilene Christian college, who *edits Restoration Quarterly,* and I may be of some interest to our readers.

"Dear Brother Leroy:

I received the first issue of your journal. It is very well done, and I congratulate you on a good job. At the same time I reserve judgment on some of the viewpoints. It sounds to me like the two-fold purpose you set forth of combining the restoration movement with a revival of philosophy seems to be a kind of 'shotgun marriage' . . . .

Best wishes,

J. W."

Dear J. W.,

Thank you for your words about my journal. The reaction generally has been encouraging, so it might be that we can do Some good.

Your reference to my twofold purpose of combining the restoration movement and philosophy as a kind of "shotgun marriage" interests me, especially since that can be taken two different ways—that I'm either *forcing* the relationship or that they *ought* to be related! I take it that you mean the former.

In reply I would emphasize that the twofold purpose is more of a restoration of primitive Christianity to modern religion and of morality to modern education. While I feel philosophy will make a substantial contribution in any moral effort, I am not especially concerned with a revival of philosophy as such. I am concerned over the moral laxness of our culture and I believe the great thinkers have left us ideals with which to instill stronger ethical standards. And it is my conviction that this goal is consistent with the restoration plea.

That philosophy and Christianity should, however, in any context be called in that union "a shotgun marriage" is to overlook their combined role in history. What would Justin Martyr say, one who never ceased wearing the philosopher's robe after becoming a Christian and who believed Christianity to be the apex of all philosophical systems? What would the early Christians think, those who looked to Plato as the great pre-Christian? Then there is Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, and on and on, men who would turn in their graves at the thought that there is a necessary gulf between philosophy and Christianity.

It was great hearing from you. Let's do this again sometime.

Yours fraternally,

Leroy Garrett

HOW ABOUT "THE MINISTER"?

W. H. Cummins, 29 Churston Ave., London, England, has written a tract on "The Minister" which deserves careful reading. He points to the absence of this functionary in the primitive churches and calls for a restoration of the teaching pastors or elders. Mr. Cummins states that some churches consider it a calamity if the minister resigns and that tongues must be silent so that the minister may be heard. He asks if public worship can be reverent and decent without the hired minister, and then he points to numerous assemblies of Christ in Britain as an indication that it can.

Mr. Cummins contends that the presence of the minister actually hinders a congregation in the exercise of its talents. He says, "God's plan is: every Christian must work (Eph. 4:16) . Man's method is: 'the minister' must do it." He further argues that Christ so constructed his church that every saint is to be trained as a minister and a priest, and that

the presence of the hired minister is a challenge to the integrity of God's plan for his people.

Our British brother seems to believe that no one, except evangelists, is to be paid for his services in the church of God. Even elders are to make their own way as they take care of the churches. He feels that the modern clergy has made a racket of preaching the gospel. He says that 1 Tim. 5:18—"The laborer is worthy of his hire"—is bent by the professional minister to fit his request for remuneration. It must be admitted that 1 Tim. 5:18 is talking about elders and not "the minister," and that if the modern clergyman makes use of it, it should be as authority for financial support for the elders. In believing that elders can and should be supported is one point in which I disagree with the Cummins tract.

As for "the Minister" it must be granted, however, that the New Testament allows no place for him. Many of the located ministers would qualify as elders and should be serving in that capacity rather than as a functionary foreign to the New Testament. Others could well serve as evangelists and with financial support. Still others are not qualified to do either, but some of these could be teachers in the church—still with pay if need be. But with the New Testament open before us it must be contended that elders are the central figures in a congregation of Christ. Yet in many of our churches today jt is the professional minister who is the leading figure, while elders themselves are virtually inactive insofar as teaching and leadership is concerned.

Cummins may have something. In the restored church the professional minister must go. Let us replace him with elders who are abundantly qualified to shepherd God's flock (Acts 20:28).

****

"It is sensible to realize that teaching is an art which can never be fully perfected. It will always need improvement tomorrow."

****

"I consider the book of Romans to be the most adequate brief philosophy of history ever written." (Nels S. F. Ferre)

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

SUGGESTIONS FOR YOUR LIBRARY

A New Testament Wordbook by William Barclay. A reconstruction of the people, customs, history and ideas that give life to the meanings of 37 great New Testament words. 128 pages. $2.50.

More New Testament Words by William Barclay. A study of another 24 words that are central to an understanding of the New Testament. 160 pages. $2.50.

Why I Am A Disciple of Christ by Hampton Adams. A spirited, personal account of his allegiance to the largest wing of the Disciple movement. It tells the story of how Barton Stone (Christians) and Alexander Campbell (Disciples) united their forces in 1832 to constitute the most remarkable religious force in American church history. 144 pages. $2.75.

The Mind Goes Forth by Harry and Bonaro Overstreet. This book comes to grips with the central problem of our times: that of overcoming the hostilities and extremisms that separate man from man. It shows how we must make living space for one another's minds and opinions. 384 pages. $3.95.

The Christian View of Science and Scripture by Bernard Ramm. An affirmation that science and religion can come to terms. Ramm shows that some friends of religion have lost their battle with science on too narrow a strip, deprecating and ridiculing apparently damaging empirical date, while they should have been developing a philosophy of science in terms of the larger problems. He treats such problems as the long day of Joshua, the six days of creation, evolution. 368 pages. $4.00.

The Religions of Man by Huston Smith. The first book to interpret how the great religious traditions answer the spiritual aspirations of the different peoples of the world. 328 pages. $5.00.

You will be interested in reading the book reviews that appear in every issue of this journal.

Order all books from Restoration Press, 1916 Western Drive, Alton, Illinois.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

THE MARCH OF THE PAPERBACKS

Listed here are some outstanding paperbacks of general interest which may be purchased from Restoration Press, 1916 Western Dr., Alton, Illinois. Some of the world's greatest literature is now in these inexpensive editions, and it is our desire to keep our readers informed of some of the possibilities.

Earliest Christianity by Johannes Weiss is a history of the period 30-150 A. D., dealing especially with the primitive church, the Gentile mission, and Paul. This is a translation and a reprint of the famous German scholar's monumental work. This is the kind of book men study in the universities. In this new paperback edition Frederick C. Grant of Union has an introduction. It comes in two volumes, 870 pages in all. The Christian Century says

of this set, “This is probably the most influential study of early Christianity ever written.” Both volumes for $4.25, which would be impossible except for the blessing of paperback.

Love or Perish by Smiley Blanton, M. D. presents the thesis that “Without love we lose the will to live.” One must love or he perishes. It is rich in psychological insight. 217 pages. $1.00.

The Religious Aspect of Philosophy by Josiah Royce is concerned with such issues as the search for a moral ideal and the search for religious truth. Royce is an important name in the history of American thought. This book will challenge you. 483 pages. $1.75.

Buddha and Buddhism by Maurice Percheron is a study of a great Oriental religion and its challenge to Christianity. If you wish to be informed on the thinking of the non-Christian religions, this is a good place to start. Scores of pictures, 191 pages. $1.35.

Meister Eckhart is a source book on the life and works of the great 14th century mystic. He influenced much of the philosophic thought of the medieval ages; he was charged as a heretic by the established church. 335 pages. $1.45.

The Archaeology of Palestine by W. F. Albright is a survey of the ancient peoples and cultures of the Holy Land. It is rich in archaeological information. It described daily life in ancient Palestine. Albright is the eminent archaeologist of Johns Hopkins University. 271 pages. $1.00 including postage.

Comparative Religion by A. C. Bouquet is a comparison of the great religions of the world, including those of India, China, Japan, as well as Islam, Judaism, and Christianity. 320 pages. $1.00 including postage.

Sacred Books of the World by A. C. Bouquet is an anthology of the “World Bible” so to speak, for it is a collection of the literature that is sacred to the different religions of man. 342 pages. $1.00 including postage.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

THE CHOICEST SELECTIONS

FOR YOUR QUARTERLY READING

The Chaos of Cults

By J. K. van Baalen

This is a study of present-day isms. It is an authoritative, readable, comprehensive treatment of the most significant cults that challenge evangelical Christianity. Included are Spiritism, Theosophy, Rosicrucianism, Christian Science, Unity, Baha'ism, Mormonism, Anglo-Israelism, Seventh-Day Adventism, Jehovah's Witnesses, and still others. Some effort is made to explain the phenomena of the cults. There is a biographical sketch of the leaders, facts of their origin, principal teachings, quotations from their literature, and a biblical refutation of their errors. 403 pages. Only $3.95.

More Than Conquerors

W. HENDRIKSEN

The publishers have put this interpretation of the book of Revelation through many printings. This book will help you to appreciate the functional value of Revelation to present-day problems. It is not premillennial. It reflects the happy combination of scholarship and readability. It is not dogmatic. While it follows its own principles of interpretation, it faithfully sets forth opposing views. Here is a good place for your education in the book of Revelation to begin-and there is a renewed interest in this difficult book in these critical times. 285 pages. $3.50.

Order from - Restoration Press, 1916 Western Dr., Alton, Illinois